



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

WANT
II.

Library of



Princeton University.

Presented by

A. G. Cameron

A
CRITICAL HISTORY
OF THE
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
OF
ANTIENT GREECE.

BY
WILLIAM MURE,
OF CALDWELL.

VOL. V.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON :
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1867.

The right of translation is reserved.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIFTH VOLUME.

BOOK IV.

ATTIC PERIOD.

CHAP. VIII.

THUCYDIDES: HIS LIFE AND TIMES.

1. General view of historical literature during the fourth century B.C.
- 2. Thucydides. His birth and parentage.—3. His age.—4. His relation to Herodotus.—5. His indirect allusions to Herodotus.—6. Or to the contents of his work.—7. His Amphipolitan campaign. His sentence of exile.—8. How far merited by his conduct.—9. His relation to Cleon. His life in exile. His restoration to his political rights.
10. Publication of his work. Its continuators. Its division into books. Authorship of the eighth book. His death.—11. His character, compared with that of Herodotus.—12. State of society which he describes.—13. Its political and military ferocity.—14. Contrasted with its intellectual refinement. Athens and Sparta - Page 1

CHAP. IX.

THUCYDIDES: HIS WORK AND ITS MATERIALS.

1. Epitome of the text.—2. Historical sources of Thucydides. Written records. Oral testimony.—3. His speeches; how far authentic documents.—4. His mythical or traditional materials. His mode of dealing with mythical legend. Its religious element.—5. Episode of Hipparchus and Harmodius. Chronology of Thucydides.—6. His work a military history - - - - - 79

CHAP. X.

THUCYDIDES: HIS WORK, ITS COMPOSITION AND STYLE.

1. Plan of the narrative. Its power, spirit, and truth. Defects of its epic economy.—2. Campaigns of Delium and Amphipolis. Pylian campaign of Demosthenes. Introductory part of the work.—3. Its episodes. Harmodius and Hipparchus.—4. The "Archæologia" of Thucydides.—5. His delineation of character. Pericles.—6. Nicias. Alcibiades. Brasidas. Cleon.—7. His speeches, as illustrative of character. Speculative or didactic element of the work.—8. Style of Thucydides in the narrower sense. His narrative style. Episode of Themistocles.—9. His rhetorical style. Its defects. Its merits.—10. His supposed discipleship under Gorgias and Antiphon. His dialect. Other characteristics of his oratory.—11. Funeral oration of Pericles.—12. Other speeches. Rhetorical style in the narrative parts of the text. His description of battles. Of the plague at Athens.
- Conclusion - - - - - Page 118

CHAP. XI.

XENOPHON: HIS LIFE AND TIMES (435—350 B.C.)

1. His birth, parentage, and early life. Epochs of his birth and death.—2. Enters the service of Cyrus.—3. March from Sardis to Babylonia in spring, 401 B.C. Battle of Cunaxa in autumn, 401 B.C. Death of Cyrus.—4. Position of the Greeks after the battle. Murder of the five generals.—5. Xenophon appointed to command a division.—6. Takes the lead in conducting the retreat. March up the Tigris. Carduchian mountains. Continued hard fighting. Western Armenia. The army overtaken by winter.—7. Fords the Euphrates. Its sufferings. Continued hard fighting. View of the sea. Arrival at Trapezus in spring, 400 B.C. Attack on the Drilæ. Cerasus. The Mosyneciæans. Cotyora.—8. Xenophon's scheme of colonial settlement. Dissensions in the army. Harmenë. The supreme command conferred on Chirisophus.—9. Heraclea. Mutiny and disruption of the army. Its remuster at Calpe. Disasters at Calpe.—10. Byzantium. Tyrannical conduct of the Spartan authorities. Service of the Greeks under Seuthes in Thrace.—11. Service under the Spartan harmost Thimbron in Asia. Sentence of exile passed on Xenophon in spring, 399 B.C. His return to Greece with Agesilaus. His settlement at Scillus. Restoration to his civic rights. His domestic relations. Close of his life.—12. Cause of his banishment. Antient authority. Modern theory.—

13. Bearings of the question on his moral character. His Spartan connexions. With Agesilaus at Coronea.—14. Harshness of his sentence.—15. His character, literary genius, and habits of life.—16. His partiality as a historian. His defective patriotism.—17. His religious belief. His philosophy. His literary style. His works Page 180

CHAP. XII.

XENOPHON: THE HELLENICA.

1. Epitome of the text.—2. Plan, composition, and materials. Tripartite arrangement of the subject.—3. Attic history. Lacedæmonian history. Hellenic history. Xenophon's personal knowledge of events.—4. His Spartan partialities. His Theban antipathies. State of Greece. Sparta. Thebes and Athens. Lysander and Agesilaus.—5. Pelopidas and Epaminondas. Xenophon's Theban history. Contrast of his Spartan history.—6. Battle of Corinth; of Coronea; of Leuctra.—7. Invasion of Laconia. Reestablishment of Messenia. Origin of the Sparto-Theban war. Sphodrias. Thessalian affairs. Helots after Leuctra. Destruction of Mantinea.—8. Agesilaism of Xenophon. Coronea. Death of Agesipolis. Seizure of the Cadmea. Phlius. Attempt on the Piræus. Dilemma of Xenophon.—9. Agesilaus and Epaminondas. Athenian affairs. Iphicrates. Thrasybulus. Conon. Delineation of character. Style in the narrower sense. Dialogue.—10. Speeches. Descriptions. Speculative remarks. Chronology of the Hellenica. Time and mode of its composition 265

CHAP. XIII.

XENOPHON: THE ANABASIS.

1. Character and composition of the work. Its commencement. Its conclusion.—2. Episodes. Illustrative and descriptive passages. The Anabasis an autobiography. How far an impartial one?—3. As tested by other authorities. Diodorus. Plutarch. Isocrates.—4. Speeches. Chiefly spoken by Xenophon himself. How far genuine orations?—5. Inconsistencies of the narrative. Transactions at Cotyora. Transactions at Cerasus.—6. Xenophon never in the wrong. Transactions at Heraclea. Transactions at Byzantium. At Cyzicus. At Parium and Perinthus.—7. Delineation of character. Proxenus. Clearchus. Menon. Cyrus. His regard for truth. His sense of justice. Sources of his popularity. His quarrel with Artaxerxes.—8. Xenophon's politico-military morality. His service under Cyrus. Transactions

in Western Armenia. The Drilæ. The Mosynœcians. The Tiberenes. Heraclea.—9. The Anabasis of "Themistogenes."—10. The Anabasis of Xenophon. When composed? Its division into books

Page 324

CHAP. XIV.

XENOPHON: THE CYROPÆDIA.

1. Epitome of the text.—2. The Cyropædia a historical romance. Character of its hero. Its historical element, as tested by other authorities. Cyrus.—3. Cyaxares. Crœsus. Other secondary persons. Geographical element. Primitive Persian constitution. Military system.—4. Miscellaneous customs. Religious worship. Persian art of war, compared with that of Sparta. Composition and style of the work. Their merits. Their defects.—5. Dialogue. Its diffuseness. Homeric commonplace.—6. Diffuseness of the narrative. Its romantic element. Episode of Abradatas and Panthea.—7. Judged by the standard of modern love-romance. Other pathetic passages. Descriptions of battles. Speeches.—8. Delineation of character. Cyrus. His facetious humour. His boyhood. His death.—9. Cyaxares. Other secondary characters. Epilogue of the Cyropædia, how far genuine - - - - - 374

CHAP. XV.

XENOPHON: HIS MINOR COMPOSITIONS.

1. His "Politics." "Polity of Lacedæmon." "Polity of Athens." Date of its composition.—2. A political pasquinade. Not by Xenophon.—3. "Hiero," or the Tyrant.—4. "On the Athenian revenues." Causes of their decline. Reforms suggested.—5. "Agesilaus." A genuine work of Xenophon. Parallel of the Hellenica; in partiality, in suppression, in misrepresentation.—6. The "Memorabilia" of Socrates. Parallel of the Agesilaus. Scope of the work. Character of Socrates, as conceived by Xenophon.—7. His range and method of scientific instruction.—8. His moral sentiment and discipline. The "Apology of Socrates." How far a genuine work of Xenophon.—9. "The Symposium." Plan of the work. Part allotted to Socrates. Epitome of the contents. The jester. The ballet-master. Panderism of Socrates. His competition for the palm of beauty. His altercation with Hermogenes, and with the ballet-master. Lascivious dance.—10. Parallel of Plato's Symposium. Xenophon's facetious humour.—11. "The Economist." Athenian system of housekeeping, and of agriculture.—12. "On the Equestrian Art." Directions for purchas-

ing a horse. His stabling and keep. Art of equitation. "The Hipparchus," or Commander of cavalry.—13. "On Hunting." Hare-snaring and netting. Deer-catching. Boar-hunting. Hunting of lions, leopards, and other wild beasts. Use and value of the art of hunting in peace and war. Sophistical objections combated Page 417

CHAP. XVI.

THE REMAINING HISTORIANS OF THE ATTIC PERIOD.

1. Loss of their works. More exact definition of the Attic period Ctesias. His service at the Persian court. His birth and age.—2. His works. His Persica. His system of early Oriental history; compared with the systems of Berosus and Herodotus.—3. Its uncritical character.—4. His Persian history proper.—5. His Indica. His mendacity. His minor works. His style. Dinon. His Persica.—6. Philistus. His age. His connexion with Dionysius I. of Syracuse. His banishment. His restoration under Dionysius II. His death and character. His works. His imitation of Thucydides.—7. Theopompus. His life and times. Orator and historian. His age.—8. His character. His works. His epitome of Herodotus. His Hellenica. His Philippica.—9. Analysis of its contents. His honesty. His censoriousness.—10. His love of the marvellous. His style. His rhetorical works.—11. Ephorus. His age. His education. His historical work.—12. Analysis of its contents.—13. His credit as a historian and geographer. His secondary works. His style.—14. Cratippus. Sophænetus. Hermias of Methymna. His Sicula. His other works. Timonides of Leucadia. His epistolary history. Athanas of Syracuse. His Syracusan history. Dionysiodorus and Anaxis. Cephisodorus. Zoilus of Amphipolis. Demophilus.—15. Phantias of Eresus. His Eresian Prytanæ. Other works. Clidemus. His Atthis. Other Atthidists. Phanodemus.—16. Callisthenes. His birth. His connexion with Alexander. His character.—17. His death. His works.—18. His Hellenica. His history of Alexander. His Periplus. His scientific works. His treatment of mythology. His style - - - 480

APPENDIX.

	Page
APP. A. On the popular errors imputed by Thucydides to Herodotus - - - - -	569
APP. B. On Hippias and Hipparchus - - - - -	570
APP. C. On the division of Thucydides into books - - - - -	572
APP. D. On the authorship of the eighth book - - - - -	573
APP. E. On the relation of Athens and Lacedæmon to their weaker allies - - - - -	578
APP. F. On the effects of epic management in Thucydides - - - - -	579
APP. G. On the rhetorical style of Thucydides - - - - -	580
APP. H. On the age of Xenophon - - - - -	598
APP. J. On the battle of Cunaxa - - - - -	605
APP. K. On the conduct of Arisæus after the battle of Cunaxa - - - - -	607
APP. L. On the banishment of Xenophon - - - - -	609
APP. M. On the case of the six admirals after Arginusæ - - - - -	610
APP. N. On the invasion of Lacedæmon by Epaminondas - - - - -	618
APP. O. On the connexion between the parts of Xenophon's Hellenica - - - - -	620
APP. P. On the division of Greek historical works into books - - - - -	623
APP. Q. On the Socratic doctrines of Xenophon - - - - -	625
APP. R. On the writers of Atticides - - - - -	628
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS - - - - -	630
INDEX TO VOLUMES FOURTH AND FIFTH - - - - -	635

PLATE.

MAP OF THE ROUTE OF THE TEN THOUSAND *to be placed at the end of the Volume.*

A

CRITICAL HISTORY,

&c.

BOOK IV. ATTIC PERIOD.

CHAP. VIII.

THUCYDIDES: HIS LIFE AND TIMES.

1. GENERAL VIEW OF HISTORICAL LITERATURE DURING THE FOURTH CENTURY B.C.—2. THUCYDIDES. HIS BIRTH AND PARENTAGE.—3. HIS AGE.—4. HIS RELATION TO HERODOTUS.—5. HIS INDIRECT ALLUSIONS TO HERODOTUS,—6. OR TO THE CONTENTS OF HIS WORK.—7. HIS AMPHIPOLITAN CAMPAIGN. HIS SENTENCE OF EXILE.—8. HOW FAR MERITED BY HIS CONDUCT.—9. HIS RELATION TO CLEON. HIS LIFE IN EXILE. HIS RESTORATION TO HIS POLITICAL RIGHTS.—10. PUBLICATION OF HIS WORK. ITS CONTINUATORS. ITS DIVISION INTO BOOKS. AUTHORSHIP OF THE EIGHTH BOOK. HIS DEATH.—11. HIS CHARACTER COMPARED WITH THAT OF HERODOTUS.—12. STATE OF SOCIETY WHICH HE DESCRIBES.—13. ITS POLITICAL AND MILITARY FEROCITY,—14. CONTRASTED WITH ITS INTELLECTUAL REFINEMENT. ATHENS AND SPARTA.

1. THE work of Herodotus closes the earlier, elementary, or "logographic" age of Greek historical literature. Thucydides introduces a more practical and critical era of historical research. Or it may perhaps with greater propriety be said that Herodotus, combining the character of "logographer" with that of critical historian, forms a link between the two divi-

General view of historical literature during the fourth century B.C.

VOL. V.

B

sions of the Attic period. The transition from the one to the other in the present volume, will render necessary some modification in the method of treatment hitherto followed in this part of our subject.

In the previous chapters, the backward state of prose composition during the fifth century B.C., with the comparative want of precise distinction between its several branches, led to our assigning a place among historians to authors who, in more advanced stages of literature, would properly rank as Miscellaneous writers ; as Geographers, Mythologers, Genealogists, Political and Biographical Essayists. The subject of this volume will be restricted to Historians alone, or writers of Historical narratives in the proper sense.

Where authors entitled, on this more limited basis, to rank as historians in right of their principal compositions, have also produced works in other departments of literature, an exception to the rule of limitation will be made in favour of those works, in so far as an insight into their contents may be essential to a full estimate of their authors' genius. Where, on the other hand, writers chiefly distinguished in other departments have also cultivated History, their historical works will receive, in their separate capacity, such attention as may be due to their intrinsic value ; our biographical notice of the authors, being reserved for the future portion of our subject with which their other standard works more immediately connect them.

The effect of the above restriction on the whole amount of materials for treatment in this volume, will be less than might on first view be expected ; owing to the still comparatively immature state of

historical literature, and to the loss of the principal works in those subsidiary branches. Geography, though still frequently forming, as with Herodotus, an ingredient of more bulky historical compilations, was less zealously cultivated as a separate pursuit in this latter part of the Attic period than in its earlier stages. The first eighty years of the fourth century B.C. (400—323) produced no such zealous travellers or diligent compilers as Hecataeus, Scylax, or Herodotus. The taste for geographical research was however renovated and extended by the conquests of Alexander, which provided enterprising men of science with new and varied opportunities for its prosecution.

Biographical literature also remained in a comparative state of infancy. It is remarkable that the few recorded works of the kind belong to the department of Literary history; being devoted, solely or chiefly, to the lives of men eminent in science or letters. We find no allusion during this period to a Biography, in the proper sense, of any great political or military character.

The taste for purely mythical history, if history it can fitly be called, which tended, with the predecessors of Herodotus, so greatly to obstruct the progress of more critical research, now became for a time dormant or extinct; to be revived however and again zealously cultivated in the ensuing Alexandrian period. Its decline in the present century may be owing, partly, to the influence of Thucydides on his immediate successors, the most eminent of whom, Xenophon, with the standard Sicilian historian Philistus, emulated that great master in restricting their subjects to real events and persons. Mythical

legend continued however, in a subsidiary form, to be blended more or less largely with History, by Ctesias, Theopompus, Ephorus, and other contemporaneous authors.

In the historical department of Miscellaneous literature, an important branch of composition, which, originating in the previous century, was matured and extended by Aristotle and his leading disciples, is that entitled "Polities," or historico-critical Treatises on the forms of government existing in Greece, or the more enlightened of the neighbouring countries. Of the numerous works of this class record of which is extant, those by or attributed to Xenophon, two in number, have alone been preserved entire, and will occupy a share of attention in our notice of his collective writings.

Another subsidiary branch of historical research, Chronology, which had been partially cultivated in the old logographic school, was now, also chiefly by the same Aristotle, matured and reduced to scientific principles. His works however in this department, of which but a few unimportant fragments are extant, seem to have been first rightly appreciated or turned to practical account by the historians of the ensuing Alexandrian period.

THUCYDIDES.

Thucydides.

2. If we accept one or two casual notices, bearing on points of secondary interest, the only contemporaneous, or, it follows, strictly authentic information that has been transmitted concerning Thucydides, is contained in his own work; and, however valuable in itself, is far from copious. Of the supplementary

accounts, the earliest now extant date posterior to the Alexandrian era, and possess but slender claim to even that inferior kind of authority which can in any case attach to posthumous tradition.

A "Life of Thucydides" therefore, in the proper sense, is precluded, as in the previous case of Herodotus, by a dearth of adequate materials, and the biographer must be content to shape his researches in the less pretending form of a Historical inquiry.¹

That Thucydides was a native Athenian citizen we learn from himself. That he belonged to the Demus of Halimus may also be admitted, on the unanimous testimony of his biographers, confirmed by the inscription on his monument at Athens.² All authorities agree however in ascribing to him, through one at least of his parents, a Thracian descent. The accuracy of this tradition is indirectly confirmed by his own assurance³ that he possessed large property

His birth
and parent-
age.

¹ The extant "Lives" of Thucydides, two in number, and commonly prefixed to the text of our editions, are both of a late period. One is by Marcellinus, an author of whom nothing is known but that he wrote after Dionysius of Halicarnassus (B.C. 30), the latest writer whom he quotes. The Tract, as its antient superscription implies, is a compilation from then existing scholia on Thucydides. The various conjectures of modern commentators concerning Marcellinus or his work will be found in an article by G. H. Grauert in the *Rheinische Museum*, 1827, p. 169.; and in Pauly, *Real Encyclopädie*, art. Marcellinus. The other "Life," by an anonymous writer, confounds the Historian with his namesake and elder contemporary, the statesman Thucydides, and is in other respects full of blunders. Of the miscellaneous notices by authors of various ages, the most trustworthy are those by Cratippus, who was contemporaneous with Thucydides, and wrote a continuation of his work. Another more obscure personage named Zopyrus, cited by Didymus in Marcellinus (§ 32. sq.), regarding the Historian's death, seems also to be characterised by the latter, though vaguely and confusedly, as his contemporary.

² Antyllus ap. Marcell. § 16. 65.; Plut. Cimon, c. 4.; Anonym. in Vit. § 10.

³ iv. 104—5.

in Thrace, and that his father was called Olorus. This is a genuine Thracian name of some celebrity. Hegesipylë, wife of Miltiades son of Cimon, the victor of Marathon, who inherited from his uncle the elder Miltiades the lordship of the Thracian Chersonnesus, was a daughter of Olorus, a neighbouring Thracian potentate¹, and bore to her husband, his successor in fame and influence, the younger Cimon. These coincidences of name and local connexion tend to confirm the further accounts of the Historian's near relation to the Cimonian family.² In one he is said to have been descended from the Marathonian Miltiades³, through his mother, who is herself reported to have been called Hegesipylë.⁴ If, as from the correspondence of names might further be surmised, there was a previous blood connexion between his father and his mother, the practice of intermarriage betwixt kindred would appear to have been prevalent in this distinguished race. The tomb or cenotaph of Thucydides is also said, in all the notices of his death, to have been situated in their hereditary place of sepulture.⁵

His Thracian possessions are placed by his biographers in the neighbourhood of Scaptesyhlë, on the coast opposite Thasus; of which island the same Scaptesyhlë, with the surrounding district, was a de-

¹ Herodot. vi. 39.; Plutarch, loc. cit. The variety Orolus, mentioned by Marcellinus, § 16., is evidently either an error of transcript, or an etymological subtlety of the later grammarians: conf. Grauert's tedious discussion of this point, Rhein. Mus. vol. I. p. 176. sqq. Thucydides, in right doubtless of this Thracian ancestry, is described by Aphthonius as of royal blood, Progymn. p. 20. ed. Porti.

² Plutarch, loc. cit.; Marcell. § 2.

³ Marcell. § 14.; Suid. V. Thuc.

⁴ Marcell. § 2.

⁵ Polemo and Antyllus ap. Marcell. 16—55.; Plutarch, Cim. 4., conf. Pausan. Attic. xxiii.

pendency. This is confirmed by his own statement¹, that the value of his property consisted chiefly in its minerals; and Scaptesyllê was the centre of the mining district of Thrace. In some accounts he is said to have inherited these estates from Thracian relatives²; in others to have acquired them by marriage with a Thracian heiress.³ It is a plausible conjecture of modern critics, that he may have been indebted for them, in part at least, to his connexion with the younger Cimon. The reduction of Thasus, and its annexation with its appurtenances to the Athenian dominions, were among the more important services rendered by that commander to Athens; and Thucydides expressly mentions⁴ the mineral district on the opposite coast as part of the annexed territory. It may be presumed that the commander who achieved the conquest, would have at his disposal a fair allotment of those portions of the newly acquired lands, which, as usual in such cases, fell to be distributed to colonists from the conquering State; and his own kinsmen would naturally be among the first to profit by his privilege.

Mention also occurs of a connexion by blood between Thucydides and the Pisistratidæ⁵, the influence of which has been supposed to manifest itself in a tone of partiality towards the "tyrants," and of disfavour to their adversaries Harmodius and Aristogiton, in the Historian's allusions to the downfall of the usurping dynasty. The passages referred to indicate, no doubt, a peculiar interest in the destinies

¹ IV. 106.² Marcell. 14.; Plutarch, Cimon, 4.³ Marcell. 19.⁴ I. 101.⁵ Hermippus ap. Marcell. § 18. The possible truth or falsehood of this very vague notice has been discussed with his usual learning and diffuseness by Krüger, *Leben des Thukydides*, p. 4. sqq.

of that family, which has led Thucydides into a long and not very appropriate digression on their affairs. The practice however, so common with the old commentators, of founding statements of fact concerning eminent authors on speculative interpretations of passages of their works, renders it perhaps more probable that the cousinship has here been suggested by the digression, than the digression by the cousinship.¹ Thucydides is further reported to have studied rhetoric under Antiphon, of whom he makes honourable mention², and philosophy under Anaxagoras.³ The authenticity of the former notice is borne out by coincidences of a very marked nature between his own rhetorical style and that of his supposed master, as exemplified in the still extant orations of the latter.⁴ The spirit of religious freethinking which everywhere manifests itself in his work, is also closely akin to that for the promulgation of which Anaxagoras was fined and banished from Athens.

His age.

3. We are told by Thucydides himself⁵ that he was contemporaneous with the whole of the twenty-seven years' war which he describes; and that he had already, at its outbreak, attained such a maturity of years and judgement as enabled him to prognosticate its dura-

¹ In the same way the Scholiast of Aristides, tom. II. (ed. Jebb) p. 121., attributes the friendly feeling of Thucydides towards Pericles to the circumstance of their being old schoolfellows.

² VIII. 68. : conf. Antyll. ap. Marcell. § 22., Dionys. Hal. de Comp. Verb. 10. ; Schol. ad Thuc. iv. 135. ; Suid. in Thucyd. and Antiphon ; Hermogen. De Formis Orat. II. p. 391. 402. ed. Porti ; Schol. Aristid. II. p. 131. ; Vita Antiphontis in Reisk. Orat. Græc. tom. VII. 603. To this discipleship Plato has been supposed to allude (in Menex. p. 236. Steph.) by the antient grammarians cited by Hermogenes and Van Spaan de Antiphonte in Reisk. Orat. Gr. t. VII. p. 803. sq.

³ Antyll. ap. Marcell. 22.

⁴ See Appendix G. No. xi.

⁵ v. 20. 26. : con. I. 1.

tion and magnitude, and to form the design of recording its vicissitudes.¹ In another place he informs us, that he commanded an Athenian fleet and army on the Thracian coast in the eighth year of the war, and that, for an imputed neglect of his duties on that occasion, he was banished, and remained in exile twenty years. This information, distinct as it is in so far as it extends, leaves ample room for conjecture regarding the epoch of his birth or the duration of his life. Traditional sources afford but two subsidiary dates; one to the effect that he was forty years old² at the commencement of the war in 431 B.C., the other that he died not long after his fiftieth year.³ These two statements are obviously irreconcilable both with his own and with each other. For, if the first were correct, Thucydides having, as we know from himself, survived the close of the war, or 404 B.C., would at that epoch have been some seventeen years older than the second admits him to have been at the time of his death. Both appear to embody mere conjectural interpretations of his own definition of the age which he had attained at the commencement of the war. That definition admits evidently of much variety of construction, according to the different views or impressions of different readers. To one it might seem that a man of so powerful and acute a mind⁴, on reaching the full age of manly discretion, let us suppose his twenty-fifth year, would be quite competent, in terms of his own remark, to plan and undertake such a work. In this case, adding twenty-

¹ iv. 104.

² Pamphila ap. Gell. Noct. Att. xv. 23.

³ Marcell. § 54.

⁴ So Aphthonius, Progymn. p. 21. ed. Porti; and Philostr. Vit. Soph. i. ix.

seven years for the duration of the war, we should have fifty-two for the age of Thucydides at its close; and as his History has been left unfinished, the further inference was reasonable, that its completion had been prevented by his premature death. Other speculators might find difficulty in ascribing so penetrating an insight into futurity, to any but a mind disciplined by long experience of public affairs, for the acquisition of which a previous lifetime of forty years might not seem more than sufficient. In the absence of more positive data, the exact length of years attained by Thucydides must be allowed to remain one of the unsettled points of his biography.

Indirect proof that he did not long survive the close of the war, has been discovered in another passage of his work.¹ In mentioning an eruption of Etna, in the sixth year of the war (425 B.C.), he remarks that it took place at an interval of fifty years after the one which last preceded it; and that record was extant, in all, of but three eruptions of the mountain. Although it has been attempted to give another turn to this statement², its natural import undoubtedly is, that the other two eruptions were both prior to that of 425 B.C., with reference to which the Historian mentions them. As therefore a fourth eruption occurred in 396 B.C., it has been argued with some plausibility, that Thucydides must have died prior to that year, otherwise he would not have limited the number of those which he knew to three only. Reasonable as this calculation appears, it were yet a fallacious groundwork of any chronological inference. The composition of the Historian's work, as we learn

¹ III. 116.

² Dodwell, *Apparat. ad Annal. Thuc.* § XXVII.; Dahlmann, p. 217,

from himself, was begun from the commencement of the war, and continued during its progress; and, apart from his own testimony, his text affords evidence that the earlier portions of it were matured substantially in their present form, shortly after the events which they describe, or at least during the twenty-seven years which his work was meant to embrace. This evidence consists in the repeated occurrence, in the earlier parts of his narrative, of statements or remarks, which, though correct or appropriate at the time when written, became at the later epochs of the war, or of his own lifetime, owing to an intermediate change of circumstances, inaccurate, or inconsistent with subsequent statements. Such passages, it is obvious, must have been written at an early stage of his undertaking, and have been overlooked by him in his subsequent revisals of the text. The subjoined examples will serve for illustration.

In describing¹ the invasion of Attica by the Peloponnesian army in the fifth year of the war, being the fourth such inroad that had yet taken place, he observes that it was, next to the second, the most afflicting of all to which the invaded country had been subjected. The second invasion, which lasted forty days, had been previously described as the one of longest duration.² Both these passages must have been written prior to the date of the last invasion, in the nineteenth year of the war, which resulted in the permanent occupation of the Attic town and district of Decelea³, the greatest calamity, next to the Sicilian defeat, which had yet befallen the republic.

In another place⁴ he mentions, that a controversy

¹ III. 20.

² II. 57.

³ VII. 18.

⁴ II. 54.

had formerly prevailed among interpreters of prophecy, whether a phrase occurring in an old oracle concerning an impending disastrous "Dorian" war, was to be read "Loimos" (Pestilence), or "Limos" (Famine). This controversy, he remarks, was, on the outbreak of the Plague at Athens, in the second year of the Peloponneso-Dorian war, very naturally decided in favour of the former reading. "But," he sarcastically adds, "if some future Dorian war should happen to be attended by famine, the party in favour of Limos would probably reassert their claims." Now it is notorious, from Xenophon and other unquestionable sources, that during the four months' siege of the city by Lysander, it was afflicted by a most severe famine; and that after the citizens had long held out obstinately, in the midst of daily increasing mortality, the entire failure of food proved the immediate cause of surrender. It is incredible that Thucydides could have alluded, in the hypothetical terms above cited, to the possibility of an event happening, if he knew that it had actually happened. This passage therefore was written in the earlier part of the War, and inadvertently left as it stands after the conquest of the city.

Other examples might be added. But the text here immediately in question may itself be adduced as an illustration of the case, though not altogether of so direct a kind as those above quoted. Assuming the statement¹ relative to Mount Etna, to have been written shortly after the sixth year of the war in which the eruption there mentioned took place, it would have been accurate at that time. If allowed to stand as originally written, until after the date of

¹ III. 116.

a subsequent eruption, it would then be at variance with the altered state of the facts; but would no more prove that the Historian died before that date, than the passage relative to Loimos and Limos proves that he died before the capture of Athens by Lysander.

The best argument that Thucydides did not long survive the end of the war, is the unfinished state in which he has left his great work. Its composition was, as he himself impresses on us, the one great object of his life. It cannot therefore be supposed, that after the close of the grand series of events which he records, he would willingly have allowed his narrative to remain, for any length of time, in its present imperfect condition; one fourth part unwritten, and a large portion of the existing text, that now forming the eighth book, to all appearance incomplete. Although therefore there may not be enough either of internal evidence or traditional authority, to prove that he died prior to 396 B.C., it is not probable that he long survived that year. The eight years between that date and the close of the war (404 B.C.), might even seem more than sufficient to have enabled him to bring his narrative down to the stage where it breaks off. Allowance however may in all such cases be made for incidental obstacles; for weak health, or distractions connected with his personal or political interests at the epoch of his restoration to his native country, amid the fierce war of factions which then prevailed. His failure to complete his undertaking has in fact been ascribed by some of his biographers to a lingering disease of which he ultimately died.¹ The prevailing tradition however was, that his lite-

¹ Marcell. § 44.; Anonym. 9.

rary labours, with his life, were brought to a more sudden termination by the hand of an assassin.¹ But no details have been given either of the motive to the act, or the time and mode of its perpetration.

His relation
to
Herodotus.

4. The relation in which Herodotus and Thucydides may have stood to each other, whether in respect to time or to their historical undertakings, is a question, apart from the interest attaching to it on other accounts, of some moment in its bearings on the chronology of either historian's life. By reference to notices supplied, partly by Herodotus himself partly by his elder contemporary Hellanicus, we have, in a previous chapter, amid the doubts and difficulties in which at best the point is involved, preferred the opinion that the work of Herodotus was not completed until after the year 408 B.C.; that the date consequently of his death must be brought down lower than that year, or towards the close of the fifth century B.C. The opposite doctrine, which would throw back that date some fifteen or twenty years, must however be admitted also to possess its share of plausibility. Here then it is that a certain chronological, as well as literary value, attaches to the question: whether Thucydides was, or was not, acquainted with the researches of Herodotus? If the answer be in the affirmative, the argument in favour of the earlier epoch for Herodotus, would not be of vital importance, as no very long interval of time between the publication of his work and the death of Thucydides, would have been required to enable the latter to profit by its contents. But if, on the other hand, the question be solved in the

¹ Didymus et Zopyrus ap. Marcell. § 32.; Plut. Cimon, c. 4.; Paus. Att. xxiii. 9.

negative, the Attic historian's ignorance would afford, and has in fact afforded, a strong argument to those who adopt the more recent date for the death of Herodotus, as having been too immediately followed by that of Thucydides, to allow the latter historian any such opportunity of access to the work of his predecessor.

The antient commentators seem never to have doubted the fact of a near literary or even personal connexion between the two authors. In our own time a different doctrine has been keenly and ably maintained by critics of high authority¹, who deny all knowledge by Thucydides either of the labours or the existence of his elder contemporary; and although their opinion has not been generally received by the modern classical public, their arguments in its favour have not hitherto undergone any conclusive refutation.

The remarks on this subject in our previous volume² were limited chiefly to the fabulous details of the joint biography of the two historians, which represent the one as a lecturer, the other as a listener, in the Olympic arena. A more careful examination of the strictly historical question regarding a connexion between them was postponed, until, in the prosecution of our general subject, the text of Thucydides had been submitted to the same closer analysis formerly bestowed on that of his predecessor. The result of this analysis has been a full conviction of the correctness of the old doctrine, to the extent at least that Thucydides was well ac-

¹ F. C. Dahlmann, *Herodot.* p. 214. sqq.; K. O. Müller, *Gesch. der Griech.-Literat.* vol. II. p. 343. : conf. Arnold ad *Thuc.* I. 20.

² p. 245. 254. : conf. Appendix G. p. 534.

quainted with the work of Herodotus. The grounds of this conviction will be here stated in detail, as tending not only, it is hoped, to a final settlement of the question at issue, but also to illustrate certain characteristic features of the Attic historian's genius.

I. Thucydides commences his history, or rather the historical Retrospect of events prior to his main subject, at the precise point where the history of Herodotus terminates. The Retrospective narrative of the one forms in fact a continuation of the main narrative of the other. It is difficult to believe that this continuity of subject in the two works can be merely accidental.

Attention was formerly directed to the judgement displayed by Herodotus, in closing his narrative with the taking of Sestus on the Hellespont, and the return home of the Athenian fleet after that achievement. Appropriate however as this conclusion undoubtedly is, whether judged by the rules of epic composition, or on purely historical grounds¹, it is very doubtful, to say the least, whether such an arrangement was likely to suggest itself to many, or perhaps to any of the other previous or contemporaneous writers by whom the same series of events had been treated. So little indeed has it been appreciated in our own time, that more than one eminent modern authority has pronounced it so defective, as to afford evidence that the work of Herodotus was, like that of Thucydides, left in an unfinished state; "there being no obvious "reason why the war should have been carried down "to this particular point;" and that the original plan of

¹ Vol. IV. p. 468. 547.

Herodotus comprised, or ought to have comprised, a further series of events.¹ It would certainly therefore be a very remarkable coincidence, had the work of Herodotus been unknown to Thucydides, that he too should have adopted this particular epoch, as the line of demarcation between the close of the one series and the commencement of another which he had himself undertaken to record. When we further find Thucydides² so pointedly characterising the period immediately subsequent to that occupied by Herodotus, as having been neglected or superficially treated by previous authors, thereby implying very plainly a greater fulness of detail in the treatment of the preceding period, it seems difficult to escape the inference that such fulness was provided by the work of Herodotus, and by it alone. For although several previous historians had written on the Persian war, Charon of Lampsacus, for example, and Hellanicus, there is no reason to believe that it had been described by any one of them at greater length or with greater precision than the subsequent half-century of Grecian history by the same Hellanicus, whose commentaries on that period are stigmatised by Thucydides³ as so incorrect and superficial, that he had found it necessary himself to pass it in review as introductory to his own proper narrative.

II. Thucydides, when treating, as he frequently does in the digressive or illustrative parts of his text, subjects common to Herodotus, confines himself with rare exception to such parts of those subjects, and

¹ K. O. Müller, Dahlmann, and others cited in Appendix M. to Vol. IV. of this work, p. 547.

² I. 97.

³ I. 97.

treats them in such a manner, as to imply that these portions of his own work were supplementary, whether in the mode of completion or correction, to that of his predecessor. The case of the two historians is here analogous to that of Homer and the Cyclic poets, illustrated in an early part of this work. The greater number of those poets celebrate, like Homer, the Trojan war, or the events connected with it. But while their principal narratives are restricted to portions of that wide subject not previously treated by him, their episodical passages contain such plain allusions to his text, as to prove to demonstration that their works were supplementary to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and hence, that they were familiar with those poems as existing in their time substantially in the form in which we now possess them. Similar is the inference from a collation of parallel portions of Herodotus and Thucydides.

The care with which Thucydides, where the tenor of his narrative led him upon what may be called common ground, avoids trenching to any extent on parts of it already occupied by Herodotus, is especially remarkable in his supplementary notices of Themistocles. With both authors this distinguished Athenian is among the great men of the previous age an object of peculiar interest. His affairs fell but in part within the immediate subject of Herodotus, by whom they are in so far copiously treated. They are altogether extraneous to the immediate subject of Thucydides. He digresses however at some length on the portion of them left untouched by his predecessor. His Episode of Themistocles¹, for so it may

¹ I. 135. sqq. : conf. 90. sqq.

with all propriety be called, is a continuation and conclusion of the previous history of the same hero by Herodotus. The one describes the earlier more prosperous period of his life, the other his declining years, misfortunes, and death.

Similar is the case with the Spartan Pausanias, the victor of Plataea. Herodotus had narrated his youthful more glorious and prosperous career. Thucydides¹, taking up the tale exactly where Herodotus left off, relates the latter disastrous vicissitudes of his life to its close.

Herodotus², in his account of the Pisistratidæ, mentions in very concise terms the murder of Hipparchus by Harmodius, but dwells at great length on the expulsion of Hippias by the Alcmaeonidæ. Thucydides³, in his episode on the same family, reverses the method of his predecessor, giving a long and detailed account of the earlier transactions, the conspiracy of the two patriots, its conduct and results, while the final liberation of Athens is disposed of in a few sentences.

Herodotus⁴, in treating of the Macedonian royal family, enlarges, with a more than ordinary profusion of fabulous embellishment, on their origin, their migration from Argos, and first settlement in their trans-Olympian territory; but omits all notice of the growth and extension of their dynasty, during the seven generations between its founder Perdiccas and the Alexander whose share in the campaign of Xerxes suggested his notice of their affairs. Thucydides⁵,

¹ I. 128. sqq.: conf. 94.

² v. 55. sq., 62. sq.

³ vi. 54. sq.: conf. i. 20.

⁴ viii. 137. sqq., v. 22.

⁵ ii. 99.

when introducing the same Macedonian monarchs on his scene of action, again reverses the plan of his predecessor. He is content with simply stating the fact of their Argive origin and settlement in Thrace, abstaining from all illustrative detail, but gives a full though condensed summary of the subsequent more authentic portion of their history overlooked by his predecessor; of the successive stages of conquest by which their empire was established; and of the names and geographical position of its provinces.¹

His in-
direct al-
lusions to
Herodotus.

5. III. The allusions by Thucydides to statements or opinions of previous writers, especially where they assume a satirical tone, admit in several instances of so curious and so pointed an application to passages of Herodotus as can hardly be the result of accident. These allusions occur chiefly in the introductory part of the Attic historian's work, in a general philippic against the simplicity with which the Hellenic public was accustomed to receive popular errors as historical truths. Of the three cases of such credulity which he has been at pains to specify, one is the belief that a division of the Spartan army bore the name of

¹ In the few cases where both authors have dwelt to any extent on the same transaction, it will be found that the account of Thucydides differs from, and hence may probably be intended to controvert, that of Herodotus. For example, both authors treat at some length of the Sicilian republic of Zancle or Messene. Herodotus (vi. 23.) gives no account of its original foundation, but devotes a large share of attention to the sequel of its history. Thucydides (vi. 4.), while affording detailed notices of its first settlement, gives a concise, but in some respects different, account of its subsequent destinies. This remark also applies to the greatly amplified description by Thucydides (i. 128. sq.) of the Cylonian conspiracy, more concisely noticed by Herodotus (v. 71.), where the former gives in several points a different, and what is doubtless intended as a corrected, account of that adventure.

the Pitánate cohort¹; another, the belief that the Lacedæmonian kings had each two votes in the Senate.² Thucydides maintains that no such cohort existed, and that each king had but one vote.³

On a first simple view of the case, it seems hardly credible that Thucydides, out of three examples so pointedly adduced in illustration of a sweeping stigma on the good sense and intelligence of his countrymen, should have given prominence to two of so far-fetched, almost trivial, a nature, unless some peculiar or adventitious importance had attached to them, such as they might derive from having been sanctioned by some notable representative of the popular Greek genius which he satirises. When therefore we find that both are promulgated by Herodotus, almost in the identical words in which they are quoted by Thucydides, and, in so far as known, by Herodotus alone among Greek authors, it seems scarcely possible to escape the conclusion, that the credulity of Herodotus is that which Thucydides had here more immediately in view. If to these considerations we add the sensitiveness, so broadly displayed throughout the introductory portion of his work in which these sarcasms occur, to his own literary honour; the elaborate, at times casuistical line of argument, by which he endeavours to establish the grandeur and importance of his own subject, as compared with what had fallen to the lot of any preceding historian; and the self-complacent, almost boastful terms, in which he contrasts his treatment of that subject with the uncritical method of his predecessors, the conclusion

¹ IX. 53. See Appendix A. § 1.

² VI. 57. See Appendix A. § 2.

³ I. 20.

becomes more and more unavoidable, that this whole commentary on the comparative merits of his own, and of other historical productions, is not of mere general application. It is not probable that he would have been at so great pains to vindicate his superiority to such unworthy competitors as Hellenicus, Charon, or Xanthus. It required some more formidable rival to awaken so much jealousy, and elicit so pointed an expression of it. But let us suppose that Thucydides, a man of a proud and sensitive mind, and ambitious of unrivalled distinction in his own field of literary exertion, had, at the time when that field was yet unoccupied but by those inferior competitors brought to a certain stage of maturity a work which formed the favourite employment of his life, on which he had staked his hopes of celebrity, and of the immeasurable superiority of which to all former efforts of the kind he was justly proud. Let us suppose further, that before he had time to carry his undertaking to perfection, the vacant arena had suddenly been entered by a rival, certainly not inferior to himself in the aggregate of his literary qualifications, though in a less intellectual branch of their common art, a rival whose very defects are alluded to by himself as sources of more immediate popularity than his own work was likely to attain.¹ Let us suppose all this, nor is it more than is borne out by probability and the internal evidence of the two compositions, and no reasonable doubt will remain of the fact, that Thucydides was not only well acquainted with the labours of his predecessor, but has, in this remarkable series of commentaries intimated clearly, though indirectly, that such was the case.

¹ I. 22. in fine.

In dwelling however on two of the three examples of Greek popular credulity adduced by Thucydides, as evidence on the one side, we must not overlook the argument which the third example has supplied to the advocate of opposite views. On this third occasion¹ Thucydides mentions, among other vulgar errors, the belief "of the Athenians," that Hipparchus, slain by Harmodius and Aristogiton, was the eldest son of Pisistratus, and at the time of his death the reigning member of the family; whereas in truth he was the younger brother, Hippias being the eldest son and his father's successor on the throne. "In this instance at least," it has been contended, "Herodotus was as well informed as Thucydides of the real facts; having, in describing the death of Hipparchus, specially designated him as 'brother of the tyrant Hippias,' not as himself the tyrant."² Thucydides therefore, it is urged, "could not here have had Herodotus in view; nor is it likely that in so severely reflecting, as has been supposed, in this same context, on the examples of his rival's ignorance, he would, had he read this passage of his book, have been so uncandid as to withhold from him the credit due to a fellow-assertor of the truth."³ Admitting what is here assumed (but is not altogether beyond question⁴), that Thucydides really believed Herodotus in this case to be free from the popular error, it must be observed, that the former historian's censure is here specially restricted to the vulgar belief of the popular "Athenian public;" while in the other two cases it is directed generally against the popular "Greek public." This distinction tends obviously to strengthen

¹ I. 20.; VI. 54. sqq.

² Dahlmann, Herodot. p. 227.

³ V. 55.

⁴ See Appendix B.

rather than invalidate our previous argument. Herodotus was not an Athenian. The limitation therefore of the stricture in the one case may seem as if intended to exclude him from its application; while the extension of it in the others, the more clearly implicates an authority who was preeminently the organ of popular Greek tradition in the wider sense.

Another point to which weight has been attached on the negative side of this question is, that while Thucydides, in his retrospective notices, differs at times materially from Herodotus, he nowhere makes any allusion to such difference, or any attempt to vindicate his own views, or controvert, as might have been expected, those sanctioned by so distinguished an opponent.¹ This argument is founded

¹ Dahlmann, p. 219. The discrepancies which we have been able to detect, inclusive of the two already noted in the respective accounts of the Cylonian Conspiracy and of the foundation of Zancle (see note to p. 20.), are but few in number, and of a trifling nature.

With Herodotus (VII. 233.), the body of Thebans who treacherously occupied Platæa is rated at 400 men under the command of Eurymachus, son of Leontiades. Thucydides describes them (II. 2.) as a few more than 300 men, and as commanded by the Boeotarchs, Pythangelus and Diemporus; while Eurymachus with him is but an influential Theban citizen, through whom the intrigue with the anti-Attic party in Platæa was mainly conducted. In each account Eurymachus accompanies the expedition, and is slain by the Platæans.

Herodotus (VI. 98.) mentions, on the authority of the Delians, an earthquake as having occurred in their island in the year before the battle of Marathon. He adds, that this was the first and the last earthquake which had visited the island. Thucydides, on the other hand (II. 8.), describes Delos as shaken by an earthquake immediately before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, and adds that this was the first that had been experienced in the island.

The disagreement which Dahlmann discovers in their respective accounts of the Thracian colony of Aristagoras of Miletus (Herod. v. in fine; Thucyd. IV. 102.) does not appear to have any real existence. Nor can the different number of ships assigned in each author to the Greek naval force at Salamis (Herod. VIII. 44. 48.; Thuc. I. 74.) be here taken

on a plain misapprehension of the historical art of the age in which both writers flourished. The practice of quoting and controverting statements of rival authors, indispensable as it seems in the historical compositions of our own age, was not the practice generally of the early Greek historians, and least of all that of Thucydides. The single author whom he mentions by name is Hellanicus¹; and him he mentions neither as an authority nor an opponent, but simply with reference to the fact, that the portion of Greek history immediately preceding his own subject had been treated by Hellanicus alone, and so imperfectly, as to render necessary his own introductory Retrospect. Even had it been the custom to controvert rival authorities, it was a custom to which Thucydides could with the less propriety have conformed, after having, in his prefatory chapters, repudiated in the mass all deference to the research of his predecessors, as fabulous and superficial. His only consistent or dignified course, after such a declaration, was to give his own view of each controverted matter, leaving his readers to judge for themselves between him and opponents whom he so lightly esteemed.

6. Far more important (IV.) than the negative argument founded on such partial discrepancies between the two authors, is the affirmative evidence contained in the habitual allusions by Thucydides to facts or events narrated by Herodotus, as to matters of general notoriety. These allusions are so numerous and varied as at least abundantly to prove that the preceding stages of Greek history had

Or to passages of his work.

into account; the statement in Thucydides not being made by himself, but placed in the mouth of an Athenian orator.

¹ I. 97.

been investigated with a care, and described with an amplitude of detail, which, were the work of Herodotus to be excluded from the existing library of Greek literature, would be inexplicable by reference to any other known source of light on the period. It would at least be necessary to award to the predecessors of Herodotus a far greater amount of credit for original research than has ever yet been claimed for them, and to himself a much smaller share of such merit than that to which he has hitherto been held entitled. The notices in question also refer, in frequent instances, not so much to events of prominent political importance, as to rare facts or anecdotes, which were the less likely to have been common, with Herodotus, to the second-rate logographers of the previous generation.

Of the many examples that occur of this species of parallel passage, the notices of Themistocles by the two authors supply some of the most pointed.

Thucydides¹ mentions, briefly and incidentally, as a well-known fact, that Themistocles, during a war with Ægina, had persuaded the Athenians to make the large addition to their naval force, which enabled their fleets to cope with those of Xerxes, during the ensuing Persian war. The details of this sage policy of the Attic statesman are given at length by Herodotus.²

Thucydides³, in the same brief incidental manner, makes the Athenian envoys remind the Lacedæmonians of the patriotic stratagem, by which Themistocles at Salamis forced the Persians to fight in the Straits instead of the open sea, and thus secured the

¹ I. 14.

² VII. 144.

³ I. 74.

victory to the Greeks. The particulars of this stratagem are likewise given in full by Herodotus.¹ In the sequel of the same passage, Thucydides mentions, also as a known fact, the special honours paid by the Spartans to Themistocles after the close of the war, for his brilliant services to the common country. Of the mode in which this mark of distinction was conferred on the Attic statesman we have a detailed account in Herodotus.²

Herodotus narrates at some length the cunning manœuvres by which the same Athenian commander, curiously combining the character of true patriot with that of Unjust steward, secured for himself, in prophetic anticipation of his impending reverse of fortune, the future protection of the Persian royal family; first, by giving Xerxes secret information of the intended Athenian movements prior to the action of Salamis³, and afterwards by dissuading the Greeks from destroying the bridge over the Hellespont.⁴ In the letter which Thucydides⁵ makes Themistocles, after his flight from Greece, address to Artaxerxes, both these acts are cited as services rendered to the father of that sovereign, and are admitted by him as valid claims to his own favour and protection.

In Herodotus⁶ we have a long and highly fabulous account of a passage of arms betwixt 300 Spartans and 300 Argives at Thyrea, in an old war between the two republics regarding the right to that frontier town. Thucydides, in describing⁷ a diplomatic negotiation between Sparta and Argos, in the twelfth year of the Peloponnesian war, makes the Argive commissioners allude to that legendary adventure,

¹ VIII. 75. 79.² VIII. 124.³ VIII. 75.⁴ VIII. 109.⁵ I. 137.⁶ I. 82.⁷ V. 41.

and suggest, in certain contingencies, a recurrence to the same mode of settling disputes. The Spartans, in their reply, characterise this suggestion, with the precedent to which it refers, as "folly." In this expression it is difficult to overlook a not unmerited sneer at Herodotus, as well as at the Argives, for attaching importance, in that more advanced period of military and political science, to precedents borrowed from the mythical wars of their semi-barbarous ages.

At an early stage of the quarrel between Athens and Corinth, Thucydides¹ introduces a Corinthian orator alluding, in the course of his argument, to a present of twenty ships, as having formerly been made by his countrymen to the Athenians in a war with Ægina, at a time when the Athenian navy was in low condition. In Herodotus² will be found a full account of this transaction.

In his notice of the Greek naval armament engaged at Artemisium, Herodotus³ particularly mentions the zeal and valour of the Plataeans, who, while themselves, as an inland people, unprovided with ships, embarked and fought on board the Athenian galleys. Thucydides⁴, in the address of the same Plataeans to the Spartans, after the capture of their city, makes them pointedly appeal to this same peculiar service rendered by them to the common cause of freedom.

Herodotus⁵ dwells, in a severely satirical tone, on the selfishness and duplicity of the Spartans, as compared with the disinterested patriotism of their Athenian rivals during the Persian war, and on the

¹ I. 41.² VI. 89.³ VIII. 1.⁴ III. 54.⁵ IX. 6. *seqq.*

indifference of the same Spartans to the sufferings of their fellow-Greeks, so long as they themselves were exempt from the common calamity. These strictures are repeated by the Athenian envoys, in very similar terms, in the speech which Thucydides¹ makes them address to the first Convention of Dorian states at Lacedæmon.

Herodotus² relates, in much detail, how the Platæans had formerly, when oppressed by the Thebans, appealed to the Spartans for protection, and how the Spartans declined the application, on the ground of their distance from the Platæan territory, and advised them to have recourse to Athens, as nearer at hand and better able to assist them. This transaction is appropriately referred to by the Platæans in the address to their Spartan oppressors³ after the capture of their city, where both the refusal of aid by Lacedæmon, and the reason assigned for that refusal, are restated in terms identical in substance with those used by Herodotus. Nor is it probably by mere accident, that while Herodotus, in his account of the first formation of this alliance between Athens and Platæa, has neglected to mention its date, the omission has here been supplied by Thucydides.⁴

V. These references by Thucydides to facts or events previously described by Herodotus, present at times, in style and expression, so near a resemblance to, or even identity with, the parallel passages of the latter author, as to warrant the belief that the words as well as the sense have, inadvertently or unconsciously, been borrowed from his text.

¹ I. 74.² VI. 108.³ III. 55.⁴ III. 68.

A remarkable series of such coincidences occurs in their joint accounts of the Conspiracy of Cylon. That by Herodotus consists but of a few lines, mentioning the main facts of the affair, as connected with the overthrow of Democracy in Athens by Cleomenes. Thucydides, having occasion to refer to the same transaction in connexion with the charge of impiety brought by the Spartans against Pericles, amplifies the concise notice of Herodotus into a detailed narrative. Subjoined are the parallel texts of each author :

HEROD. v.71.—*Cylon was an Olympic victor among the Athenians, who, aspiring to Tyrannical power, collected his adherents and attempted to seize the Acropolis. But, the enterprise proving unsuccessful, he sat down as a suppliant at the feet of the goddess. From this position they were removed by the Prytanēs who then held sway in Athens*¹ . . .

THUC. i. 126.—*Cylon was an Athenian Olympic victor who, consulting the oracle, was instructed by it to seize the Acropolis of Athens. . . . He accordingly seized the Acropolis with a view to Tyrannical power. . . . They sat down as suppliants at the altar. . . . But those charged by the Athenians with the public safety removing them from this position*² . . .

Herodotus, in his notice of the usurper Pisistratus, gives him credit for many qualities of a wise and

¹ ἦν Κύλων τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀνὴρ Ὀλυμπιονίκης. Οὗτος ἐπὶ τυραννίδι ἐκόμησε· προσποιησάμενος δὲ ἑταιρήτην ἡλικιωτέων, καταλαβεῖν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἐπειρήθη. Οὐ δυνάμενος δὲ ἐπικρατῆσαι, ἰκέτης ἦζέτο πρὸς τῷ γαλμα. Τοὺτους ἀνίστασι μὲν οἱ Πρυτάνεις τῶν ναυκράρων, ὅπερ ἐνεμον τότε τὰς Ἀΐνας, ὑπεγύουσι πλὴν θανάτου.

² Κύλων ἦν Ὀλυμπιονίκης ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος . . . χρωμένῳ δὲ . . . ἀνείλεν ὁ θεὸς . . . καταλαβεῖν τὴν Ἀθηναίων ἀκρόπολιν . . . ὁ δὲ κατέλαβε τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ὡς ἐπὶ τυραννίδι . . . οἱ δὲ . . . καθίζουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἰκέται . . . ἀναστήσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς οἱ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπιτετραμμένοι τὴν φυλακὴν

virtuous sovereign. Thucydides, in his supplementary account of the usurper's sons, bestows a like commendation on them, especially on Hipparchus, in terms offering similar points of correspondence:

HEROD. i. 59.—He governed the city according to the established laws, *adorning it beautifully* and well.¹

THUC. vi. 54.—He *established* his government on no invidious footing, . . . and they *adorned the city beautifully*.²

Herodotus informs us that Pisistratus purified Delos, by removing the graves situated in those parts of the island which were within view of the temple. Thucydides, in describing the subsequent more complete purification in 426 B.C., incidently mentions the course formerly pursued by Pisistratus in terms nearly identical with those of Herodotus:

HEROD. i. 64.—Purifying as much of the island as lay within sight of the sanctuary.³

THUC. iii. 104.—He purified as much of the island as could be seen from the sanctuary.⁴

To these passages may be added the two above referred to, regarding the Plataean alliance with Athens; where however the correspondence is less in the words than the sense:

HEROD. vi. 108.—But declining the proposal they replied, *We dwell at a great distance*

THUC. iii. 55.—But you sent us away, and counselled us to turn to *the Athenians*, as

¹ ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖσι κατεστειώσι ἔνεμε τὴν πόλιν, κοσμέων καλῶς τε καὶ εὖ.

³ τὴν νῆσον . . . καθήραμε . . . ἐπ' ὅσον ἐποψίς τοῦ ἱεροῦ εἶχε.

² τὴν ἀρχὴν . . . ἀνέπιθύνως κατεστήσατο . . . τὴν τε πόλιν ἀντῶν καλῶς διεκόσμησαν.

⁴ ἐκάθημε . . . ὅσον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐφεωρᾶτο τῆς νήσου.

from you. . . . We therefore advise you rather to give yourselves up to the Athenians, who are your near neighbours.¹

being near at hand, while you dwelt at a great distance.²

Amphipolitan campaign of Thucydides.

7. The only events in the Historian's life of which we possess strictly authentic notices, those supplied by himself, are: His having been resident at Athens during the Plague in the second year of the Peloponnesian war, and having been himself one of the few among those attacked who recovered from the disease³; his having held an important command in Thrace in the eighth year of the war; his having been degraded from that command on account of alleged misconduct; his subsequent twenty years' exile from Athens; and his return to his native city at the close of that period.⁴

During the early part of the Peloponnesian war, the Athenian interest seems to have been paramount, or greatly in the ascendant, in that part of the north-western shore of the Ægæan, which might not improperly be called the Hellenic Thrace. This district comprised the broken line of bays and promontories, extending from the Thermæan Gulf on the south-west, to the Isle of Thasus on the north-east; the larger portion of which, occupied chiefly by Greek settlers, was the great peninsula of Chalcidicë, with its three well-defined headlands, Pallene, Sithonia, and Athos. Nearly in the centre of this district lay Amphipolis on the river Strymon, a flourishing Attic

¹ οἱ δὲ οὐ δεκόμενοι ἐλεγόν σφι τὰδε· ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐκαστέρῳ τε οἰκούμεν . . . συμβουλευόμεν δὲ ὑμῖν δοῦναι ἡμέας αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναίοισι, πλησιόχωροισι τε ἀνδράσι . . .

² ὑμεῖς ἀπεώσασθε, καὶ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἐκτελεῖτε τραπέεσθαι ὡς ἐγγύς ὄντας, ἡμῶν δὲ μακρὰν ἀποικούντων.

³ II. 48.

⁴ IV. 102. sqq.; v. 26.

colony, and a place of great political and financial importance to Athens, not only as the metropolitan seat of her empire in this region, but as one of her principal depôts of naval stores and timber for ship-building. Amphipolis however was not itself a maritime town. This defect was made up by her dependency Eion, a commodious harbour, situated a few miles lower down the river, near its issue into the sea; hence also familiarly styled the Port of Amphipolis. In the summer of the eighth year of the war, Brasidas, the ablest Spartan general of that day, invited by Perdiccas of Macedon whom he had persuaded to play false to Athens, and by the Lacedæmonian party in the Hellenothracian republics, marched rapidly from Bœotia through Thessaly and Macedonia, with a moderate force, and formed a junction with his ally Perdiccas in the Chalcidicæ. Being unprovided with ships, his operations were carried on entirely by land. In the course of a few weeks, he without opposition made himself master of the Athenian vassal states of Acanthus and Stagirus, and in the ensuing autumn undertook the far more important conquest of Amphipolis. The enterprise was well-timed. Thucydides, on whose presence and local influence, apart from the force under his command, the Athenians greatly relied for maintaining their hold on the place, was absent in a distant part of his province. There remained but a small number of regular troops, if any, for the defence of the town, under his colleague or lieutenant Eucles.¹ Brasidas,

¹ It was the Athenian custom to intrust the command of any important station to several Strategi, officers combining the functions of naval and military commanders with those of provincial governors. But usually,

advancing by a rapid night march from his quarters in the Chalcidicæ, suddenly appears beneath the walls on the afternoon of the next day, and by aid of the small faction friendly to Sparta, succeeds in occupying the outer defences and principal approaches to the citadel, so completely as to preclude all hope of any effective resistance by the force under Eucles. In this emergency, the leaders of the Athenian party dispatched Eucles with intelligence of the state of things to Thucydides, then at Thasus, distant about half a day's voyage, in the hope of being able to hold out until he should come to their relief. On receiving the intelligence he at once set sail with the seven triremes immediately at his disposal. But in the meanwhile Brasidas, partly by intimidation, partly by mild and conciliatory offers, persuades the citizens to surrender. Thucydides, hearing of this catastrophe by the way, stops short at Eion, which he

if not invariably, one of the number was invested with a certain superiority to his colleagues. Among other cases in point are those of Nicias (IV. 42. 53.) and of Demosthenes (III. 91. 93. sqq.), who alone appears as planning and directing the disastrous Ætolian expedition; of his colleague Procles, after the mention of his appointment, nothing more is heard but that he was slain in the general rout of the army. There can therefore be no doubt that Thucydides had on this occasion the direction in chief of the Athenian interests in Thrace; and that Eucles, nominally his colleague, was virtually his deputy or lieutenant. It is evident from the Historian's own account that the whole effective force of men and ships was with himself at Thasus. It is even left doubtful whether Eucles had any regular troops under his command; or whether he may not rather have been left at Amphipolis in little more than the quality of Athenian resident commissioner, to direct or concur with the municipal authorities in maintaining the Attic interest in the place. If, in § 104., we adopt the reading retained by Arnold, which designates Thucydides as τὸν ἑτερον στρατηγὸν τὸν ἐπὶ Θράκης, instead of τῶν ἐπὶ Θράκης, Eucles would then more distinctly appear as only governor of the town of Amphipolis, while Thucydides was commander in chief of the whole district.

reaches in time to anticipate and frustrate the attempt of Brasidas to take it also by surprise.¹

For his conduct on this occasion the Historian was deprived of his command and visited with penalties, the exact nature of which he has not explained, further than that they involved his twenty years' exile from Athens.²

His sentence of exile.

The supplementary notices of this affair by his popular biographers, seem as devoid of authenticity, as the commentaries which accompany them of impartiality or sound criticism. They all more or less proceed on the assumption that Thucydides had been unjustly treated. They suppose, and not unreasonably, that a man of so much talent and patriotism as his work shows him to have possessed, could not have been guilty either of treachery, or serious mismanagement in any official capacity; that he must at least have acted to the best of his means and opportunities; and that his exile was the penalty of no graver crime than want of success, an unpar-

¹ IV. 78. 84. 102. sqq.

² VI. 26. There were two modes in which the punishment of exile might be made effectual; one by a simple decree of banishment, usually involving confiscation of goods; the other where the accused, fearing a harsher sentence, declined appearing before the tribunal, and thus voluntarily incurred the penalty of outlawry. The crime laid to the charge of Thucydides is described by his biographers (Marcell. § 55.) as that of Treason. But this term does not necessarily imply wilful treachery, or favour to the enemy. Certain more serious cases of culpable negligence, those more especially involving the loss of a city or fleet, formed, in the public law of Athens, a species of constructive treason, those guilty of which were liable, like traitors of a worse description, to the penalty of death. It was customary however, in these more venial cases, to extend indulgence to the criminal, by conniving at his flight or absence when summoned to take his trial, and thus reducing his punishment from death to exile. Such was probably the Historian's case.

donable one in the eyes of those who sat in judgment on his case. This mode of reasoning was the more natural, that the disaster occurred at a time when the ultra-democratical party was at the height of its power in Athens, under the leadership of Cleon, the least scrupulous pander to its caprices; Thucydides himself being favourably affected to the aristocratic interest. Cleon accordingly, in all the speculations on the subject, is assumed to have been the arch-enemy, of whose malicious persecution the Historian was an innocent victim. However creditable this view of the case may be to the feelings of an admiring posterity, it is not certainly warranted by an impartial estimate of the facts, even as stated by the defendant himself in his own cause.

The account given by Thucydides of his services in Thrace, and of the general conduct of this campaign on the Athenian side, is marked by a brevity and a reserve, difficult to explain in a manner favourable to himself. He nowhere informs us of the epoch at which he was appointed to the command of the province, whether before or after the arrival of Brasidas. We are first apprised of his holding the office at the moment of the assault on Amphipolis, when affairs had already taken such a turn, that the mention either of himself or his position could no longer decently be dispensed with. Here we have, from whatever cause, a departure from his usual, if not invariable practice, of naming the officer intrusted with any important command at the time of his appointment, especially where the station over which he presided afterwards became the scene of memorable events, or his own conduct a subject of serious animadversion. But this is not the whole singularity of the case. During the

earlier summer career of Brasidas, while he was rapidly achieving the conquest of Athenian colonies, and otherwise undermining the Attic interest in Thrace, down, in fact, to the afternoon of his appearing before Amphipolis, we are not only left in the dark as to whether the Athenian officer in those parts was Thucydides or some other person whom he afterwards superseded, but whether there was any Athenian officer at all in the district. The single allusion in his text¹ to measures taken by the Athenians for protecting their interests, where he tells us that, "on hearing of the march of Brasidas and the defection of Perdiccas, they established a closer watch over their Thracian allies," does but add by its vagueness to the general mystery. Who were the Athenians that ordered this increased watchfulness? The Athenian authorities at home, or the Athenian officer in the province? If the former, by what means did they effect their object? If through the agency of the latter, why are we not apprised of his existence, name, and mode of action, matters of such vital moment as affecting both the Historian's credit and the history of this memorable campaign? While "the Athenians" were so careful to watch their allies, how happens it that not a hint should occur of watchfulness over the movements of their daring and energetic enemy, still less of any attempt to oppose or obstruct them? That an author, usually so distinct in his historical details, should, in this particular instance, where his honour was vitally at stake, have left his readers so dependent on their own conjecture, is certainly a strong argument that he had nothing very satisfactory to communicate.

¹ IV. 82.

From the mode in which he limits his share in this campaign to the operations connected with the fall of Amphipolis, and specially to his non-arrival in time to save the place, his apologists have been led to infer, as on his own authority, that an imputed slackness in the performance of that particular duty was the sole ground of his condemnation. In more critical quarters this can hardly appear the whole sum and substance of his offending. His habitual truthfulness entitles him no doubt to credit, when he assures us that he used all possible diligence in coming to the relief of Amphipolis, after receiving the message of Eucles. It would however, for reasons stated in the sequel, be doing injustice to the Athenian government to suppose, that an imputed half-hour's delay in any such case would have been visited by so cruelly severe a penalty. Nor can Thucydides fairly be charged with attempting to convey such an impression. In describing the fall of Amphipolis he restricts himself to the mere facts of that disaster. The mention of his exile occurs in another part of his work ; and the expression which he there uses, merely defines the time, without particularising the cause of his disgrace, further than that it was a consequence of his "military command at Amphipolis."¹ It might perhaps with better reason be assumed, that he has been at pains to narrate in detail the least censurable part of his conduct, while passing over in silence the transactions in which he felt himself to blame.

How far
merited by
his con-
duct.

8. The main points of the case against him are obviously involved in the question : How happened he to be lying idle with his fleet and troops at Thasus, the most

¹ v. 26.

distant extremity of his province, while so formidable an enemy was rapidly achieving, in its centre and opposite extremity, the series of conquests which ended in the capture of the most important Athenian possession in Thrace? No answer has been given by Thucydides, or by any one of his advocates, to this question; and until it is satisfactorily answered, the reasonable presumption must be, that he was in the wrong. Thasus could not be threatened by Brasidas. It lay as far from Amphipolis to the north, as the scene of the Spartan warrior's earlier successes from the same city to the south. Nor could it in any case have been much exposed to danger, being only accessible by sea, and Brasidas had no ships. The place which naturally presented itself to a wise governor or prudent tactician, as his head-quarter in such an emergency, was, if not Amphipolis itself, Eïon, the port and naval station of Amphipolis, three miles distant at the mouth of the river, and in the centre of the whole threatened district. But at this most critical moment, Eïon was left as unprovided with naval or military defences as Amphipolis. The natural inference therefore seems to be, that the Historian's fault was, not so much his slowness in repairing to his proper post in the hour of danger, as his having permanently absented himself from that post at so critical a time. It might perhaps be urged, that Thasus itself may have been exposed to danger; that disaffection may have existed in the island, or among the dependent tribes of the neighbouring continent. In that case however the Historian would surely have mentioned the existence of such a state of things, as furnishing the best apology for his conduct. But

the facts seem altogether at variance with any such hypothetical vindication. Had Thasus now been ripe for revolt, the opportunity offered by the sudden departure of Thucydides with his force, and the brilliant success of the Lacedæmonian arms, would not assuredly have been let slip. But the island remained true to Athens for many years afterwards. As for danger to the Athenian interest from the neighbouring continental tribes, he himself precludes any such supposition, by his pointed mention of the influence which his large mineral property secured for him in the district.¹ But may not this very fact, his extensive interest as a proprietor in that extremity of his province, furnish an explanation of his preference of Thasus to Amphipolis or Eion as his head-quarter? The centre of the Thracian mining district, where his own possessions were situated, was Scaptēsylē, on the coast immediately opposite Thasus; and the principal town and port of that island was also the chief emporium of the mineral trade of Thrace. In the absence therefore of all other apparent motive for his being stationary in the extreme north of his province, while Brasidas was conquering the principal cities of its south and centre, it is not very uncharitable to suppose, that the fault laid to his charge, and not without reason, was his having been more occupied with his own affairs than with his official duties, at a time when the latter had an imperative claim on his undivided attention.

Nor is it a light matter that he neither attempts to vindicate himself nor specifies the ground of his sentence. Such reserve on the part of a man conscious

¹ IV. 105.

of innocence, and smarting under a sense of injury, would indeed be a surprising instance of human forbearance. A historian whose subject involved mention of an act of grave injustice committed against himself, was surely entitled, or even bound, to say a few words in his own vindication. The common assumption that his imputed crime was merely his failure to perform the voyage from Thasus to Amphipolis as rapidly as the democratic leaders at home might affect to consider practicable, is injurious to the Attic government of that period. Whatever may have been its conduct in the later stages of the war, when the popular mind was soured by reverses, undue severity in judging its military officers cannot at this time be laid to its charge. Thucydides, if himself the victim of such severity, would have been the less likely to suppress other examples of it. No argument of his having been unfairly treated could weigh more strongly with posterity, than the adduction of other similar cases of harshness. There occurs however but a single one, prior to the Syracusan disaster, throughout the chequered vicissitudes of Athenian military enterprise which he describes. It is where the three Strategi, convicted, or at least found guilty, of having been bribed by the Sicilians to withdraw the force under their command from the island on terms degrading to Athens, are punished, two with exile, the third with a pecuniary fine.¹ This was certainly but a mild sentence for the crime of actual treason, whether real, or, as Thucydides seems to imply, only imputed. But as a general rule, where mere mismanagement was the alleged fault, and no

¹ IV. 65.

suspicion existed of culpable motives, we are more led to admire the leniency than to blame the severity with which offenders were treated. The Ætolian expedition of Demosthenes¹ is a remarkable instance; an enterprise undertaken with inexcusable rashness, against the advice of allies well aware, from local knowledge, of its difficulties, and terminating in the disgraceful flight and ultimate destruction of what Thucydides himself describes as the finest body of native Athenian troops fitted out during the war. Yet after a short interval, without any notice of his having been either punished or called to account, we find the same Demosthenes still in command on the same station. Nicias is also described as chargeable in various instances² with blunders or oversights, more palpable, and even more fatal in the end, than the supposed delay of Thucydides between Thasus and Amphipolis. What the republic required was zeal, activity, and devotion; and in no instance where these qualities were displayed, does ill success, at this stage of the war, appear to have formed a ground of prosecution, or even of serious complaint.³

¹ III. 94. sqq.

² VI. 104., VII. 42.

³ It is proper here to mention that the author, the better to form for himself, by reference solely to original sources, an independent judgment on this delicate point of the Historian's biography, abstained from examining those parts of the works either of Bishop Thirlwall (vol. III. p. 268. 2nd edit.) or Mr. Grote (vol. VI. p. 565. sqq.), in which it is treated, until this portion of his own text had been composed and written out to the very letter as it is here printed. The only additional remarks which a reference to either authority has suggested, are contained in the note below to p. 45. It will be seen that his view is the same in substance as that of Mr. Grote, although with some variety in the details. This result, while it may possibly tend to influence the reader in favour of our joint opinion, has been a source of gratification to the author,

Of the precise period and circumstances of his degradation and impeachment, whether before or after the ensuing capture by Brasidas of Toronë and other Thracian towns¹, or of the mode in which he was arraigned or condemned, no account has been transmitted either by the Historian or his popular biographers.

9. The statement of those authorities that Cleon was the chief author of his disgrace, while unsupported by authentic data, is in itself probable, in so far as that demagogue, being then high in influence, would be the most natural person to take the lead in enforcing penalties against a delinquent member of the moderate party. It is certainly remarkable that Thucydides, usually so guarded in his judgements, especially where unfavourable, on the characters of public men, should have taken such pains to expose the political presumption and military incapacity of this particular statesman. On the other hand it must be remembered that Cleon, among the public characters of this period, is the one most notorious for the defects which Thucydides satirises. Had therefore the Historian thought fit to abandon his habitual reserve in any special instance for the purpose of introducing a Therâsites, whose defects should act as a foil to the brilliant qualities of Themistocles, Pericles, or Alcibiades, or to the more homely virtues of Nicias,—Cleon is the man who, even apart from motives of personal dislike, would have offered himself as best adapted to the purpose. Several

His relation to Cleon.

from his having had frequent occasion on other points to differ widely from his eminent contemporary.

¹ IV. 109. sqq.

modern writers, on the other hand¹, admirers or apologists of the Athenian democracy, have endeavoured to vindicate Cleon at the expense of Thucydides, by supposing the sarcasms of the latter to be the principal basis on which the now received estimate of Cleon's character is founded; that those sarcasms therefore, being themselves instigated by vindictive feeling, may be set aside as groundless aspersions, or exaggerations of venial defects.

The question which here arises, resolves itself very much into a comparative estimate of the character of Cleon for political discretion and military genius, and that of Thucydides for historical truthfulness; a question which can, by reference to existing data, admit but of one decision. Thucydides, with all his great qualities, was not certainly exempt from human weakness; and it is quite possible that he may, under the peculiar circumstances here supposed, have been tempted to gloss over transactions discreditable to himself, or to caricature the failings of a political adversary. But the estimate of his character which the critical public of every age has formed on the internal evidence of his work, our only authentic source of knowledge, is hardly compatible with his having been guilty of the deliberate misrepresentation implied in the theory of Cleon's vindicators. That would be giving him credit, not only for dishonesty, but for a disregard of his own fair fame, scarcely conceivable even in a dishonest man moderately gifted with common sense. His description² of the

¹ Droysen, *Aristophanes* 1^{ter} Theil. p. 298. sqq.; Grote, *Hist. of Gr.*, vol. vi. pp. 458. 476. 459.

² iv. 27. sqq.

scene in the Athenian assembly, where Cleon appears in so discreditable a light, was prepared, it must be remembered, for a strictly contemporaneous public. It may be highly coloured; but were it not essentially true, the narrator would have been liable to be convicted of falsehood by, to use a classical figure of speech, "not less than thirty thousand witnesses," many of them friends and partisans of the calumniated statesman, and who would not have been slow in denouncing Thucydides as a liar and a slanderer. Yet not a hint transpires of the Historian having ever been exposed to any such charge on account of this part of his narrative. The assumption that Cleon's reputation with posterity is founded on the supposed misrepresentations of Thucydides or the satires of Aristophanes, involves other strange anomalies. It were surely something unexampled in the annals of national biography, that the popular impression of the character of the most popular demagogue of the most brilliant period of Attic history, should be founded exclusively on the misrepresentations of one or two malicious caricaturists. Yet nowhere in antiquity is there a trace of any estimate of Cleon's character different from that authorised by Thucydides.¹ Little weight can attach,

¹ This complete unanimity of the native contemporary public and of posterity, has been altogether overlooked by Mr. Grote, in his elaborate vindication of the demagogue's character. "No man," says he (vol. vi. p. 659.), "thinks of judging Sir R. Walpole, Mr. Fox, or Mirabeau, from the numerous lampoons circulated against them; no man will take the measure of a political Englishman from *Punch*, or of a political Frenchman from the *Charivari*." We concur in the illustration,—slightly modified however by adding the word "solely" before the word "from," in each case where the latter occurs in the passage quoted: and we remark confidently, that if the authority of every leading historian of the

in the face of these positive proofs, to the purely speculative argument by which alone they are met, that the contemptible part assigned to Cleon in the Historian's page, is difficult to reconcile with the influence which he acquired and exercised in the great and enlightened republic of Athens. Other cases are certainly not wanting in the annals of republican government, or of human nature, where a combination of reckless audacity, with those rhetorical arts which consist in finding fault and pandering to popular caprice, has procured for men of inferior intellect a similar sway over as large and as rational bodies of men as the Attic democracy.

His life in
exile.

The Historian is variously reported by his biographers to have fixed his abode, after his banishment, in Thrace¹, in Ægina², and in Italy.³ He himself gives us to understand that he had no settled residence, being diligently engaged in watching the events he had undertaken to record, in different parts of the wide theatre over which they extended. That he passed much of his time in Peloponnesus he indirectly assures us.⁴ The other secondary notices on the subject are improbable. The fact of his being

age of those modern statesmen were as clearly on the side of the lampooners, of Punch, and of the Charivari, as the authority of Thucydides and Theopompus is on the side of Aristophanes in the case of Cleon, and if not a single voice were recorded in an opposite sense,—we should without hesitation adopt the description of the lampoons, Punch, &c., as substantially correct. The further analogy which Mr. Grote attempts to draw between Cleon and Socrates fails altogether; and for a like reason,—the entire absence in the case of the latter of that unanimity which forms the strong point of the case against the former.

¹ Dion Hal. De Thuc. Jud. 41.; Plutarch De Exil. 14.; Marcell. § 25.

² Marcell. § 24.

³ Timæus ap. Marcell. § 35.

⁴ v. 26.

an Athenian outlaw is conclusive against his having found refuge in Ægina, then a province of Athens. A permanent residence in a remote corner of Thrace would have placed beyond his reach those varied sources to which he must have been indebted for his equally varied and copious stock of materials, even admitting that he retained his Thracian property and right of domicile. This however is not likely, the district of Scaptēsylē being, like Ægina, a dependency of Athens. The Italian tradition may probably originate in a confusion between the Historian and the Statesman Thucydides¹, who seems to have visited Italy in the course of his political vicissitudes.

Thucydides informs us generally, that he was himself personally cognisant, as an actor or eyewitness, of much of what he describes. But except his Thracian misadventure, and his having been afflicted with the Plague at Athens, he has not specified any event, civil or military, at which he was actually present. The only passage which may seem to admit such a construction, is in his description of the battle of Mantinea; where he tells us that the Lacedæmonian army, when drawn up in line, "appeared the greater of the two."² The natural sense of these words certainly is, that the line so appeared to the person who makes the remark;

¹ There can hardly be a doubt that this is the case with the allusion by the Anonymous biographer to his residence at Sybaris shortly before "his ostracism;" a notice which has been so implicitly adopted by Krüger (*Leben des Thukyd.* p. 50. sqq.), in aid of his visionary theory as to the near domestic relations between Thucydides and Herodotus.

Regarding the connexion between the Historian and Archelaus king of Macedon, confusedly hinted at by Marcellinus, the reader so disposed will also find the usual amount of diffuse speculation in the same *Leben des Thuk.* p. 61. sqq.

² v. 68.

and this sense is further borne out by an expression in another place, implying his having, after his banishment, been present, as a looker on it may safely be assumed, at some of the more important movements on the Peloponnesian side.¹ But apart from such specific notices, the graphic precision of many of his descriptions, of Syracuse for example, or the Bay of Pylos, sufficiently evinces his familiarity at least with the localities described.

His restoration to his political rights.

The only authentic notice of his restoration to his political rights, its date or occasion, is his own statement², that his exile, which commenced in 423 B.C., lasted twenty years. If "twenty" be here understood as a mere round number, his return may be supposed to have taken place more or less immediately after the peace of 404 B.C., which is said to have been accompanied by a general amnesty to political offenders.³ If the notice, on the other hand, be taken by the letter, the date of his return would coincide with the successful enterprise of Thrasybulus for the restoration of free government. In this case Thucydides may be presumed not to have availed himself of the amnesty during the political degradation of his native republic under the Thirty tyrants, but to have preferred a more honourable reinstatement as one of her liberators from that humiliating oligarchy.

Authorities are generally agreed⁴ that Thucydides,

¹ v. 25.

² v. 26.

³ Pausanias, Attic. XIII., describes him as having been indebted for this act of grace to a special motion by an orator called Cænobius; but under what circumstances we are left to conjecture.

⁴ Cicero De Orat. II. 13.; Marcellin. § 23. The opposite notices in the Anonymous Life confound the Historian with the Statesman Thucydides.

fond as he is of garnishing his narrative with speeches, was neither himself a professional orator, nor took any active part in political debate. That he had however diligently studied oratory, may be inferred from the knowledge of its most subtle arts, displayed in the rhetorical portions of his text. The internal evidence of these passages also bears out the statement of the native critics, that his style was formed partly on the more solid eloquence of Antiphon, founder of the earliest Attic school of professional rhetoric¹, partly on the model of Gorgias, and other leading masters of the more florid Sicilian school.² Dionysius of Halicarnassus³ describes him as having held several other military appointments prior to his command in Thrace; and although this statement seems, like many others concerning him, to be merely conjectural, it is not in itself likely that he would have been appointed to a post of such importance, without having, in a previous subordinate capacity, afforded proof of his competency.

10. It has been generally assumed by modern critics, on the strength of a vague passage of Diogenes Laertius⁴, that the work of Thucydides not only remained unfinished at his death, but that no part of it was published during his lifetime; and that posterity is indebted to Xenophon for its final publication in its present form. This view however is opposed to the testimony of Cratippus, an author here

Publica-
tion of his
History.

¹ See note to p. 8. *supra*.

² Antyllus ap. Marcell. § 36. 51.; Dionys. Hal. De Thuc. Idiom. 2., De Thuc. Judic. 24., De admir. vi dic. Demosth. 4. 8., Ad Cn. Pomp. de Platone; Philostrat. Vit. Soph. I. ix., Epist. XIII. p. 919.; Schol. Thuc. iv. § 135.

³ De præcip. Hist. 3.: conf. Suid. in Thucyd.

⁴ In Xenoph. § 57.

possessing peculiar claims on attention, as being the only ascertained contemporary of the Historian to whom we are indebted for any information concerning him. Dionysius ¹, after describing Cratippus as contemporaneous with Thucydides, and as author of a supplement to his interrupted History, quotes him as the proposer of one among the current explanations of the well-known peculiarity of the eighth book, the absence from its narrative of those set speeches which abound in the others. The cause of this peculiarity was, according to Cratippus, that Thucydides, having observed that those portions of the already completed text had been found tedious by his readers, had determined not to insert any more such matter in the sequel of his work. This notice, whatever the intrinsic value of its author's theory regarding the speeches, is at least indirect evidence that the earlier portions of the Historian's work had been published, not only before his death, but sufficiently long before it to enable him to take the opinion of the critical public regarding them. It may perhaps be said that this opinion might have been obtained by the expedient of oral recital, or reading aloud, which, as practised in those days, was considered in some measure equivalent to written circulation. But this was evidently not the impression under which Cratippus made his statement, and it is with that impression alone that we have here to deal. Cratippus would have been a man of very obtuse intellect, had he failed to perceive that the same reason (whether true or false matters little to the present argument ²), which

¹ De Thuc. Jud. 16.

² The explanation of Cratippus is preferable at the worst to that suggested by some modern commentators, that the eighth book afforded

he assigns for the Historian's omitting the speeches from the eighth book, would have operated equally as a motive for expunging them from the previous seven, unless he had already committed himself by their publication. He would hardly have been satisfied, in clearing one small portion of his work of tedious digressions, to send forth the remainder of it full of such blemishes; not to mention the anomaly involved by the difference of method in the different parts of the same work, which, as it now exists, offends the critical reader. There can therefore be no reasonable doubt that Cratippus believed Thucydides to have himself published the earlier part of his History; and such belief on the part of a contemporaneous man of letters, and one himself nearly interested in the work as continuator and commentator, amounts to proof of the fact.

Apart from the testimony of Cratippus, unless the first seven books had been published by the Historian himself, it would be difficult to explain why they should have been worked up to so high a state of perfection during his life, while the eighth book

no similar opening for displays of oratory. The reverse may confidently be asserted. If we except the earlier stage of the war, while Pericles still lived, in no part of the Historian's subject were so many remarkable orators in a state of activity, or with better opportunities for exercising their talents. It may suffice to mention Alcibiades, Antiphon, Theramenes, Andocides. The debates among these statesmen, during the momentous fluctuations in the Athenian constitution described in this part of the narrative, were surely as well worth being recorded as those in the Sicilian Councils of books six and seven. The Historian himself characterises the last speech of Antiphon, in defence of his conduct as a party leader in these political struggles, as one of the most remarkable ever delivered. Could he not, if he had thought fit, or had time, have introduced it as appropriately, and with as good effect, as the long harangue of Hermocrates in vi. 33.?

remained imperfect, and the rest unwritten. This is not the usual process followed in our own age, where the original design of an author has been to complete and publish a work in its collective integrity; nor was it assuredly in the age of Thucydides. In such cases the whole is first written in a more or less rough form, and subsequently undergoes, in the order of its parts, its several stages of completion and polish. It is only where the primary intention has been to issue a work in separate allotments, that the earlier portions are first fully matured, while the rest remain incomplete or uncommenced. The adoption of this method by Thucydides would also explain the elaborately finished character of his Introductory dissertation, or "Archæologia" as it has been called. Where an author, after having fully digested the plan of his work, resolves to publish it in parts, it is the customary course now, and was doubtless also in the time of Thucydides, to issue the preface to the whole with the first of the separately published volumes. But where the work is not intended to be circulated at all till finished, no author would ever think of completing his preface till he had completed his book.

Admitting then, on the testimony of Cratippus and from the inherent probability of the case, that the first seven books were published during the author's life, it is further certain that no portion of them was published prior to the close of the war. The proof of this is, that in every part of their text there occur passages distinctly alluding to the war as concluded. It may be presumed therefore: I. That after the close of the war, the portion of the work now comprised in the first seven books, and which terminates with the great Syracusan catastrophe, being already in an

advanced state of preparation, was completed and published by its author; II. That the continuation had, at the date of the author's death, been brought down, in a more or less digested form, to the close of what now forms the eighth book, and was posthumously published.

Cratippus is said by Plutarch¹ to have carried on the history of the Peloponnesian war and of Greece, from the point of interruption at the close of the eighth book, to Conon's victory at Cnidus in 394 B.C.; and this statement is partly confirmed by Dionysius², who describes him as author of a supplement, or Paralipomena, to Thucydides. That the Hellenica of Xenophon was composed as a continuation of the same eighth book is certain, as well from the united testimony of the antient critics, as from the mode in which Xenophon commences his subject; and the same was the case, as we learn on equally unanimous antient authority, with the Hellenica of Theopompus.

Its continuators.

The parts of the Historian's narrative have above been cited with reference to its present division into books. There is however no reason to believe that this arrangement was sanctioned by himself or by the earlier editors of his History. Dionysius, in quoting the remarks of Cratippus on the absence of speeches from the eighth book, makes him designate it merely as "the latter portion of the History." Had the present more definite adjustment of the text been known to Cratippus, he would probably have referred to it in a case where preciseness of definition was desirable. It also appears that this division was not the only one familiar to antient

Its division into Books.

¹ De Glor. Athen. 1.

² De Thuc. Jud. 16.

commentators. Diodorus¹ mentions one into nine, and Marcellinus one into thirteen books. The latter author adds, that there were other modes of distribution, which he does not specify; but that the present was the most common, and had been described as such by Asclepius or Asclepiades, a grammarian probably of more antient date than Dionysius², the earliest commentator now extant by whom it is noticed. It is also the only one observable in the existing manuscripts. The division into thirteen books was familiar to the Grammarians of later times, and is frequently noticed by the Scholiasts on the text. The limits of the separate books of this arrangement have also, in several instances, been defined with some precision by those authorities.³

The Historian's text supplies no internal data for judging what may have been the mode of distribution adopted by himself. He never refers, as Herodotus frequently does, to past or subsequent portions of his narrative, as forming distinct sections or discourses. The same remark here occurs as in the case of his predecessor, that it is not likely, as supposed by one antient commentator⁴, that so voluminous a book would have been put forth by its author without some kind of textual division. Positive data

¹ XII. 37., XIII. 42.

² Marcell. 57. : conf. Schol. Thuc. I. 56. ; Suid. in Asclepiades ; Krüger, *Leben des Thuk.* p. 83.

³ Appendix C.

⁴ Schol. to IV. 135. The annalistic arrangement which Thucydides so scrupulously follows as a chronological distinction, could hardly have supplied an appropriate division into books, from the great inequality of the allotments; some years of the war furnishing material for but two or three pages, while others extend over fifty or sixty.

are equally wanting as to the title by which it may have been designated by Thucydides. In the opening passage he merely defines the subject as "The war between the Peloponnesians and Athenians."

In the preceding pages, the latter part, or eighth book of the History, has everywhere been cited as the genuine composition of Thucydides. For although its title to this honour has been disputed, on grounds some of which are not devoid of plausibility, the preponderance of evidence, as regards the integral substance of the text, is conclusive on the affirmative side. On the other hand it appears certain, as well from the unanimity of native tradition as on valid grounds of internal evidence, not only that this book remained unpublished at its author's death, but that it was left by him in an incomplete state. Traces of redaction by a strange hand may also be discerned in portions of its text. In the tradition which disputed its genuine origin, three competitors are named for the honour of spurious authorship; the Historian's daughter, Xenophon, and Theopompus.¹ If their rival pretensions be restricted within the more reasonable bounds of posthumous revisal and editorship, those of Xenophon are clearly entitled to a preference. Not only is the preponderance of testimony in his favour, but he was, from his own literary character and pursuits, in every respect the man of the day most likely to have been selected for such an office by the Historian's executors. And this external evidence in his favour is supported by the Xenophontean character of several of those passages which, while foreign to the manner of Thucydides, bear marks of supplement to, or correction of an original text.²

Author-
ship of
the eighth
book.

¹ Marcell. § 43. : conf. Diog. La. in Xenoph. § 57.

² Appendix D.

His death. The traditions concerning the place of the Historian's decease are numerous and conflicting. According to Cratippus, and Zopyrus¹, an obscure author also cited as contemporaneous, he died in Thrace; according to Didymus², at Athens; according to Timæus³, in Italy; according to Apollodorus, in Asiatic Æolia⁴. The principal weight here seems due to the account of Cratippus, both as that of a contemporary and from its own intrinsic value. It has also been preferred by Plutarch, who alludes to the Historian's death, or rather his assassination, at Scaptesyllē, and to his remains having been brought to Athens and deposited in the burial-ground of the Cimonian family, as matters of notoriety.⁵ There is much inherent probability in this account, in the fundamental fact at least of the Historian's death in Thrace. It has been shown, in a previous part of this inquiry, that he took a warm personal interest in his Thracian property; and his inducements to a settled domicile in that region were not probably diminished in his declining years. Even after his restoration to his civic rights, a residence at Athens might have lost much of its

¹ Marcellinus, 33. (conf. 45.) In the passage here quoted Marcellinus rejects the opinion of Zopyrus (that the Historian died in Thrace); "although," he adds, "its correctness does happen to have been vindicated by Cratippus." This expression would seem to imply that Zopyrus was, like Cratippus, a younger contemporary of Thucydides, and had been the first to publish an account of his death which had been corroborated by Cratippus. In the sequel however it is stated by the same Marcellinus, that Zopyrus had been quoted by Didymus, as placing the Historian's death, not in Thrace, but at Athens. It has been proposed to reconcile this discrepancy by changing *Θράκη*, in the first passage of Marcellinus, into *Ἀρρυχῆ*. But this whole text seems to abound in errors or false readings: conf. Poppo, vol. i. p. 31.; Grauert im Rheinisch. Mus. 1827, p. 184.

² Ap. Marcell. 32.

³ Ap. Marcell. 33.

⁴ Ap. Steph. Byz. in Parparon.

⁵ In Cimon, c. 4.

charm to one who seems to have had little taste for domestic politics, and who had been subjected by his fellow-citizens to degrading penalties, involving exile during the best twenty years of his life. There can be no doubt that his monument, whether sepulchre or cenotaph, with his name inscribed, was shown in the time of Pausanias in the Cimonian cemetery, situated, it would appear, without the Melitian gate of the city, near the suburban village of Cœlë.¹

In the legendary notices of his domestic relations, Thucydides is represented as a married man, and as the father of a son and a daughter.² The wife and daughter are left anonymous. Of the son, Timotheus, nothing more is recorded than the name. The daughter shares, as we have seen, with Xenophon and Theopompus, the credit of having continued the interrupted labours of her father.

11. In following up this sketch of the life of Thucydides by a concise review of his character, it has been considered desirable to combine with that review a comparative estimate of his genius, and that of his distinguished rival Herodotus; the case being one in which the aid of contrast, at all times an effective means of illustrating human qualities, seems to be more peculiarly available.

His character compared with that of Herodotus.

Herodotus and Thucydides were, in respect to the whole, or greater part of the active life of each, contemporaneous. They were, the one by birthright the other by choice and adoption, citizens of the same commonwealth. They enjoyed similar advantages of birth and education, wrote under the same in-

¹ Paus. Att. xxiii.; Plutarch, loc. cit.; Marcell. 16. 55.; Anonym. Vit. Thuc. 10.

² Marcell. § 53.; Suid. in Thucyd.

fluence of political and patriotic feeling, on subjects of a strictly national character and presenting other points of resemblance. They each possessed in a high degree the more valuable qualities of historical writers. Yet the difference between their productions, in composition and style, in the scope and character of the intellectual capacity and in the tone of moral and religious sentiment which they reflect, is of that peculiar nature which is commonly observable between writers, not merely of different tempers but of different ages and stages of society. Herodotus has been characterised, in a former chapter, as a man whose habits and sympathies were identified with "the good old time;" with the age of which he wrote rather than that in which he lived. Thucydides may, with equal justice, be pronounced still more in advance of the intellectual standard of the times, than Herodotus was in arrears of it. It would not indeed be easy to name, in any period of pagan antiquity, a man so generally devoid of the prejudices of paganism. The one therefore may be considered as representing the progress of the age, the other its conservative or stationary element. In the one the working of a naturally clear head and sober judgment, is liable to be disturbed by a lively imagination and unsuspecting simplicity of heart. In the other a powerful but over-subtle intellect is frequently led, by its excess of speculative acumen, to overstep the just limits between sound argument and sophistry. The one everywhere exhibits a confiding deference for national tradition in all its forms, historical, mythical, and poetical. In the other a zealous spirit of research after historical truth is combined with a contempt for

all popular legend, unless in so far as it may seem to embody a substantial element of fact. The veneration of Herodotus for the sound religious doctrine of a Supreme providence and its retributive justice, extends to all or most of the vulgar superstition by which, in his native Pantheon, that doctrine was partly disfigured, partly adorned. Thucydides exhibits a marked indifference to, if not positive disbelief in, the whole fabric of pagan faith and worship, from the summit of its visionary superstructure to its more solid basement of natural religion. In Herodotus the frank expression of his own opinions and feelings borders occasionally on egotism. Thucydides, on all convenient occasions, disguises his own judgments on men and things by delivering them in the words of others.

Among the more delicate modes in which the openness of the one character and the reserve of the other betray themselves, may be remarked, that the text of Herodotus throws a clear light on the nature and extent of his literary attainments. That of Thucydides is comparatively barren of such data. The former, it is true, enjoyed, in the varied character of his subject, opportunities that were wanting to his rival, for a display of such properly scientific qualifications, geographical, astronomical, or philological, as he possessed. He was however under no similar obligation to exhibit his acquaintance with polite literature. Yet Herodotus quotes, inclusive of anonymous writers, from fifteen to twenty authors in different branches of composition, some of them in repeated instances; and the influence exercised on his genius by several of them is perceptible throughout his work. The direct appeals of Thucydides

to former writers are limited to Homer and Hel-
lanicus, and these are quoted merely as historical
authorities. He also gives us incidentally to under-
stand that he was conversant with the works of
“all” the previous historians, or “logographers” as
he calls them.¹ But with the above two exceptions,
neither book nor passage of any author is referred
to.² This barrenness of such allusion can hardly
proceed from ignorance in a contemporary of Sopho-
cles, Euripides, and Aristophanes, and one whose
whole tone of sentiment and language proves him to
be a highly educated man. It does but the more
clearly mark his essentially practical turn of mind,
and his disinclination to stray from the direct course
of his subject, or expose himself to the charge of that
undue excursiveness which he condemns in others.
It must however also be admitted, in justice to
Herodotus, that his references to the popular litera-
ture indicate an exercise of critical judgement which
is wanting in Thucydides. The former on several
occasions speculates, and with some acuteness, on the
age and genuine character of the works which he
quotes. Thucydides, from the unqualified manner
in which he subscribes³ to the popular belief that the
Delian hymn to Apollo was a genuine production of

¹ I. 97. : conf. 21.

² Two passages of the History may seem to contain traces of anony-
mous citation from popular poets. The concluding section of the ad-
mirable speech of Nicias (VIII. 77.), *ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλις, καὶ οὐ τείχη, κ.τ.λ.*,
is a celebrated maxim of Alcæus, paraphrased also by Æschylus, So-
phocles, and other writers (see Vol. III. p. 267.). The description
of Spartan dainties in IV. 26., *μήκωνα μεμελιτωμένην, καὶ λίνου σπέρμα
κεκομμένον*, also sounds more like a fragment of Alcman, than an original
text of Thucydides. See Vol. III. p. 201. sq. ; and the passages of Alc-
man there referred to.

³ III. 104.

Homer, in the face of internal proofs to the contrary, which could not have escaped his acumen had his attention been called to them, may be presumed not to have been much conversant with such questions.

If Thucydides has less opportunity, he also shows less inclination than Herodotus to hazard opinions on points of speculative science, beyond the immediate requirements of his narrative. His geographical commentaries are limited to countries where his scene of action is laid, and are neither frequent nor copious. His remarks on physiological questions amount to little more than an occasional sneer at the prevailing credulity, which instead of explaining the phenomena of Nature by natural causes, ascribed to those phenomena a counteracting influence on her own economy. In two passages alone does he distinctly imply that his own views were more sound or more sceptical.¹ In one he remarks that an eclipse of the sun could only take place at the time of new moon. Here he stops short; content with stating the fact which he knew, and leaving the reader to seek in some more professedly scientific quarter, the explanation which he was probably himself able to afford. The other is where, after describing the ravages caused by an influx of the sea during an earthquake, he adds, that without an earthquake he did not believe any such effect could be produced.² His work as little indicates as that of his predecessor a knowledge of any tongue but his own. There is however this difference, that while Herodotus, by the philological speculations in which he indulges, shows the extent of his ignorance, Thucydides, by abstaining from all such

¹ II. 28. : compare also VII. 50.

² III. 89. : conf. VII. 79.

discussions, withholds the means of estimating his knowledge. Amid the general neglect of philological pursuit in those days, the most that, on conjectural grounds, can be claimed for him, is an acquaintance with the Thracian tongue, both on account of his near connexion by blood and property with Thrace, and of the personal influence which, as he himself informs us, he possessed among its native population.

While the general tone of thought and feeling in both authors indicates essentially honest and truthful minds, Thucydides, in regard to historical or political impartiality, appears on the whole to have the advantage. The impartiality of Herodotus has been considered in every age liable to doubt, and has been keenly attacked on at least plausible grounds. That of Thucydides has never been seriously questioned in any itself impartial quarter. No undue leaning either towards Athenian or Spartan, democrat or oligarch, has been or can fairly be imputed to him. He has not indeed left us in doubt as to his own political opinions. Like every other great writer of antiquity, he was opposed to pure democratic government. But any charge of partisanship, that might be founded on his expressions of favour¹ to the aristocratical principle, is effectually neutralised by his unqualified admiration for the character and policy of Pericles, the most distinguished promoter of democratic privilege, and by the elaborate panegyric on the Athenian republic which he places in the mouth of that orator. Of his dispassionate judgement on international questions, something may perhaps be due to circumstances as well as to his own sense of equity. One honourable trait of his character, which in the

¹ VIII. 97.

vicissitudes of his fortune or his narrative is never effaced, is his genuine Attic patriotism. This feeling, if allowed its full influence in a work describing a life and death struggle between two rival interests, might have shown itself in modes too favourable to the side on which the author's own sympathies were enlisted. The wound inflicted by the result of his Amphipolitan campaign, may hence have helped to cherish and maintain that rigid impartiality which is everywhere perceptible; and posterity may thus have profited by his disgrace and exile, as well in this respect, as in the leisure with which they provided him for the prosecution of his research.

As a whole however the character of Thucydides, as reflected in his own page, is that of a less amiable man than Herodotus. His judgements of human conduct are more remarkable for the accuracy of their moral distinctions, and the subtlety with which they are drawn, than for generosity of feeling or appreciation of virtue. The elaborate care with which he dresses up his pictures of vice, and analyses the complex variety of forms which it assumed in his own time, seems to indicate, if not a naturally morose disposition, a temper soured by disappointment, and contrasts unpleasantly with the genial warmth of feeling that animates the moral judgements of Herodotus. This morbidity of temperament may also possibly have its advantage, as contributing to that dispassionate estimate of men and things which forms one of his chief merits as a historian. Where however his personal feelings are concerned, it shows itself in a less creditable manner, in the sarcastic, almost malignant terms, for example, of his indirect allusions to Herodotus.

State of
society de-
scribed in
his work.

12. The contrast above traced in the genius of the two authors may be extended with equal effect to that of the times of which they wrote, as exhibited in the work of each. It is one sadly to the discredit of the more advanced stage of society. In the picture presented by Herodotus, of Greece during and prior to the Persian war, the character of the people, under all the varied forms and fluctuations of their political government, of oligarchy, aristocracy, democracy, of settled constitution, revolution, usurpation, still appears under its best and most agreeable aspect. The sentiment of local patriotism is combined, in Athens and other leading states, with zeal for the national honour and interests. The conflict of factions tends to elicit the virtues rather than the vices of the citizens. Men of commanding talent and generous tempers rise to the head of affairs. Bad causes acquire dignity from the character of their supporters. The despotism of the usurper is often so blended with the virtues of the paternal sovereign that the extinction of freedom seems to promote the welfare of the subject people. No material change for the worse is perceptible during the ensuing half-century. The period between the Persian and the Peloponnesian wars, may be considered as that of the greatest prosperity ever enjoyed by the Greek states. Those naturally restless communities appear animated by as general an inclination as they were capable of experiencing, to repose from war and faction, and occupy themselves with those arts of peace which they so rapidly carried to perfection. The maritime republics were content, by a partial sacrifice of independence, to enjoy tranquillity under the as yet mild sway of Athens.

Sparta, retaining her previous ascendancy among the continental states, relapsed into those habits of political sluggishness for which she was proverbial, when no motive of self-preservation, or other powerful inducement, impelled her to extend her sphere of action beyond her Peloponnesian circle of interests. Wars no doubt there were during this period, but they were of a comparatively languid character, and carried on more with a view to the better consolidation of peace, than, as afterwards, from a thirst of conquest or impatience of rival influence.

But the germs of future turbulence were steadily ripening beneath the outer surface of tranquillity. The policy of Athens had been, during the whole period, a plausible course of self-aggrandisement at the expense of her weaker neighbours; and her protectorship of the maritime republics placed at her disposal pecuniary resources surpassing those of the rest of Greece united. This accumulation of power and wealth in the hands of an ambitious rival, led the Dorian states to unite the more closely for their security, and at length provoked their leader Sparta to resent and oppose the threatened encroachments on her own immediate province. The part taken by Athens in the quarrel between Corcyra and Corinth in 432 B.C., as a first step to the spread of her influence from the eastern to the western extremity of the Hellenic body politic, forms, in the judgement of Thucydides, the immediate cause of the Peloponnesian war.

The commencement of that war is an epoch of marked deterioration in the Greek character. As Athens is the state from which the social revolutions

of Greece mainly derive their tone, it is in the vicissitudes of Athenian politics that the change is chiefly observable. Pure democratic government acts, where it acts most effectively, under the guidance of some ruling demagogue, on the choice of whom consequently the spirit of its action depends. In the century prior to the Peloponnesian war, disinterested patriotism and simplicity of manners in the mass of the citizens, insured a preference of able and virtuous rulers, and produced an abundance of such men qualified to direct affairs. In the ensuing period these qualities were supplanted, in the people by political pride and self-indulgence at home, oppression of dependents abroad; in their leaders by subserviency to popular caprice. There could hardly be a more efficient course of democratic policy than that pursued at Athens under the direction of Miltiades, Aristides, Themistocles, Cimon, and Pericles; or one more disastrous than that which ensued under Cleon, Nicias, and Alcibiades. Pericles, who died in the third year of the war, was the last example of that rare union of civic virtue with political and military genius, which distinguished the earlier brilliant series of democratic rulers. Nicias, surpassed by none of his predecessors in sterling moral worth and pure patriotism, wanted energy and genius as a statesman or commander. In Alcibiades, political and military genius of the highest order was exercised in reckless defiance of moral principle. The common characteristic of the other Attic leaders who figure towards the close of the war is a mediocrity of talent, which as little qualified them to grapple with the martial energy of Lacedæmon, as with the licentious impolicy of the home government.

This deterioration is common to the confederacy at large; though less marked perhaps, in Sparta owing to the greater uniformity of her social habits; in the secondary states, owing to their more limited field of influence. The wholesome restraint which fear of the foreign invader had imposed on local feuds and jealousies was now removed. The rival communities, from whom we part in Herodotus still united in defence of the common country, reappear in Thucydides bent on the ruin of each other; and the barbarian enemy is courted by each of his former adversaries as a welcome ally against their former confederates. Never were the hostile passions of any people called forth with greater intensity, or in a greater variety of modes, than in this memorable civil war; and never has such an ebullition of international animosity been described with more vivid effect than in the narrative of Thucydides. During seven and twenty years, all the resources of several scores of high-spirited commonwealths, all the faculties of their citizens, were on the stretch to forward the work of mutual destruction; the sea swarming with fleets and squadrons, flitting from coast to coast, and island to island; some engaged in combating each other, in assaulting hostile ports, or ravaging hostile shores; others in transporting land troops for service in the interior, where armies of corresponding numbers were everywhere as actively employed. In the negotiations carried on during temporary suspensions of arms, all the machinery of diplomatic fraud was put in motion with hitherto unexampled effrontery; treaties violated, promises broken, vows perjured. The motives of action were not every-

where the same. Those of state policy, by which the leading combatants were influenced, were less active among their weaker neighbours, were made up by ties of party, tribe, or antient alliance, or even, where a neutral course would have been preferred, by the necessity of taking a side; the rule, that whoever is not for us is against us, being strictly enforced, unless in the rare instance of some defaulter powerful enough to assert his right of neutrality. The whole contending body was ostensibly ranged under the banners either of Athens or of Sparta, as the chiefs, the one of the Ionian, the other of the Dorian race; the one of the naval, the other of the military power of Greece; the one of the Democratic, the other of the Aristocratic interest. These bonds of union were not however so close as to preclude, among the members of each league, a number of lukewarm, insincere, or doubtful partisans, sufficient to relieve the monotony of federal war by defections, changes of policy, and intestine revolutions. In some of the states, Corcyra, Argos, Samos, the struggles of faction were marked by a virulence and ferocity unparalleled in the previous annals of Greek party feud.

Its political and military ferocity.

13. One most lamentable feature of difference between the two periods is the recklessness of human life, or rather the thirst for human blood, which everywhere horrifies the modern student of Thucydides. Battles between Hellenic armies, if less frequent, were often as bloody, and perhaps as fiercely vindictive¹, in the one period as in the other. But of those cold-blooded, deliberate massacres of unarmed, often harm-

¹ Herod. vi. 75.: conf. 78. This act of the maniac Spartan was considered in his own day a monstrous case of exception.

less, bodies of Greek citizens by their fellow-countrymen, so familiar in the page of Thucydides, there is little if any trace in that of Herodotus. In the struggles of hostile faction which he describes, at Athens or in other parts of Greece, we hear nothing of any sweeping destruction of their opponents by a successful party. No paid assassins are found posted at convenient corners of the Pnyx or Agora, to pick off the more distinguished victims, where a wholesale butchery was thought inexpedient. There can be no better proof of the comparative rarity of such acts of political murder in the earlier period, than the fact that almost the only one recorded by Herodotus, that of the Cylonian conspirators, which would hardly deserve mention among the excesses of a like nature during the Peloponnesian war, was considered of such importance in its own day, as to form one of the most memorable epochs in the annals of Hellenic faction. Massacres of a far more aggravated nature are so frequent in the narrative of Thucydides, that we become habituated to them as ordinary occurrences. The announcement by the Historian, that on the surrender of a besieged city "the adult male citizens were slain, the women and children sold as slaves," forms a sort of recurring commonplace in his text, like those which record the dates of years of the war, or the transitions from the summer to the winter season. Nor had such outrages in many cases the excuse of being committed in the heat of victory, or after an obstinate resistance involving perhaps heavy loss to the conquerors, or otherwise under the immediate impulse of excited feelings. The question whether some five thousand Hellenic freemen should or should not be slaugh-

tered, for no other crime than asserting their liberties, or faithfully serving an ally to whom they were bound by antient ties of gratitude and friendship, is frequently reserved for grave discussion in the senate-hall, and decided commonly on grounds of pure expediency; those of humanity or justice being purposely kept out of view by the orators on the side of mercy (so we are assured by one of themselves¹) as irrelevant to the occasion, and more likely to fatigue or offend the audience than to procure votes. The difference between the two periods may be illustrated by the subjoined pair of examples. If ever there was a case in which treason to a national cause, and service in the ranks of an alien enemy, could have justified the destruction of the offender by the party betrayed, it was the defection of Thebes to the interest of Xerxes. Yet all the vengeance exacted was the death of the two political leaders who had guided her counsels. On the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, a generation afterwards, Plataea, the Greek republic which, perhaps above all others, had distinguished itself by its patriotic resistance to the Medes, was, mainly as an act of grace to that same Thebes, expunged by Sparta from the map of Greece, and the whole population of the city on whom the destroyer could lay his hands was massacred in cold blood; the only crime laid against her being her adherence to her old ally Athens, to whose protection against Theban oppression she had, by the advice of Sparta herself, originally been induced to resort. Nor must it be forgotten that this act of atrocity was perpetrated on men who had signalised themselves by martial achievements in defence of their city, unsurpassed in the annals of Greek warfare, achievements

¹ III. 44. sqq.

which in better times would have secured for a conquered enemy, from a generous victor, not mercy alone, but admiration and honourable treatment. Such generous feelings seem to have been completely extinct among the warriors of Greece during this crisis of her history. No trace at least of their active influence appears in the page of Thucydides. Humanity was reserved for occasions when it could be made subservient to expediency. The garrison of Sphacteria was spared alive, owing to the advantage which the possession of three hundred Spartan prisoners of rank gave to the Athenians in their subsequent dealings with the enemy. In their conduct towards friends and allies, as towards rivals and opponents, self-interest was the ruling principle of both Athenians and Lacedæmonians. The few examples of disinterested devotion to a common cause under adverse circumstances, are on the part of inferior members of either alliance; and the apathy with which, in repeated instances, the humble but faithful confederate has been left to destruction by the protecting power, in the face of promises of support, forms another distressing feature in the character of the age.¹

The whole number of adult male Greek citizens thus deliberately massacred by their own countrymen, during the twenty-one years of the war described by Thucydides, can hardly be rated at much less than 15,000; to which about a fourth of that number may be added for the remainder of the contest; in all, from 17,000 to 18,000.² When we consider

¹ Appendix E.

² The passages from which this estimate has been made up are: I. 30., II. 5. 67., III. 32. 34. 50. 68. 70. 81. 111., IV. 46. 48. 57. 74., V. 32. 83. 116., VI. 61., VII. 3. 23. 53., VIII. 21. 65. 66. 70. 73.; Xenoph. Hellen. II. i. 31. 32., II. ii. 6. The principal items are the massacre of the whole

the veneration entertained, in theory at least, by the Greeks for their own race, as compared with other "barbarous" nations; its limited numbers, and the obvious expediency of maintaining them for the common safety, in at least their existing proportion to the foreign enemy and the slave population; it might have been supposed that motives of policy, if not of humanity, would have interfered to check a system by which, in a general war of any length, the free population of some districts was liable to be exterminated, and that of most others seriously reduced. The advantage derivable from the practice by either contending party could be but trifling. Where no quarter was given by either, the loss of troops or of partisans to each must have been nearly balanced. But the diminution of the Hellenic population at large was a calamity common to the whole confederacy.

The perpetration of such atrocities by rival Greek

adult male free population of Melos (5000?) and Scionē (1500?) by the Athenians; and of that of Hysia (1500?) by the Spartans. In these and other cases, where the exact numbers have not been given by the historians, the conjectural estimate has been taken on a moderate principle. Melos, for example, was probably as populous a state as Mitylene; and as the leaders alone of the aristocratical party in the latter (also slain by the Athenians) amounted to 1000, the whole adult population of the former may reasonably be rated at 5000. About 1200 in the list of Thucydides, and 3000 in that of Xenophon, are prisoners of war. The former number however, it must be observed, comprises scarcely a third of the whole slain; having been limited to the proportion which can fairly be assumed to have been Greek freemen. The number of Athenian captives slain by Lysander (Xenoph. II. i. 32.), after the action of Ægospotami, has been rated at 3000; taking the Athenian ships of the fleet at 100 only, and the Athenian freemen of each crew at 30. Were we to add the prisoners of war omitted on the ground above stated, the whole number of persons described by Thucydides and Xenophon as butchered in cold blood during the war, would be little short of 20,000. And this does not include any portion of the captives taken at Syracuse, unaccounted for by Thucydides, or the 2000 Helots mentioned by him in IV. 80.

communities seems to have been considered by themselves, or is at least represented by their Historian, as a sort of international privilege peculiar to their own quarrels; venial, if not meritorious, when kept within the proper conventional forms, but a scandalous abuse when usurped or irregularly exercised by alien intruders. This distinction is curiously illustrated by the indignantly pathetic strain, in which Thucydides enlarges¹ on the excesses committed by a band of Thracians in the pay of Athens, in the Bœotian town of Mycalessus, in a hostile country consequently, as contrasted with the tone of philosophical indifference in which he notices, as mere matters of fact, the comprehensive butchery by his own countrymen of their fellow-Hellenes of Melos and Mitylene.

That Thucydides partook of the prevailing insensibility to the value of human life, appears from the unconcerned manner in which he everywhere retails such ferocities, without moral reflexion or remark; still more perhaps from the cursory terms in which he notices, or rather suppresses, the ultimate fate of his own Athenian fellow-citizens in the Latomië of Syracuse. After describing the brutal treatment which the whole body of prisoners had experienced from their captors, during the first three or four months of their confinement, he informs us that the survivors, at the end of that period, were sold as slaves, "with the exception of the Athenians, and of those belonging to the Hellenic States of Sicily and Italy." What became of these, comprising, it might be supposed, not the least interesting portion of the whole in the estimation of an Attic historian,—whether they were slaughtered,

¹ VII. 20.

or allowed to linger and die, one by one, the same miserable death as so many of their comrades before them,—we are left to conjecture. That Thucydides viewed the crime of murder even with indulgence, when committed for political purposes of which he approved, may be gathered, it is to be feared, from his character of Antiphon, whose multiplied acts of assassination were not inconsistent, in the Historian's opinion, with his being "second in virtue to no man "of his age."¹

Contrasted
with its in-
tellectual
refinement.

14. There is no work of classical antiquity which conveys a less favourable impression of the Greek character than the History of the Peloponnesian War by Thucydides. He not only presents us with the dark side of the picture, but presents it unrelieved by any of those softer or brighter touches which we habitually associate with the genius of Hellenism. His narrative is all but exclusively engrossed with political and military affairs. On the general state of society in Greece, on her science, art, and literature, he affords no information whatever. Not a word of the splendour of her public monuments, the brilliancy of her dramatic representations, the marvels of her sculpture and painting. In so far as Thucydides is concerned, we should never have known that such men as Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, or Aristophanes, as Phidias, Anaxagoras, Gorgias, or Socrates, ever existed. Yet with all these the Historian was contemporaneous. The sums expended by Pericles on the Propylæa are specified as a statistical fact, along with those bestowed on the construction of walls, or the equipment of ships. The statue of Minerva Polias is also mentioned; but merely with reference

¹ ἀπερὶ οὐδενὸς ὕστερος.—VIII. 68. See Arnold's note.

to the golden ornaments with which she was decked, and their convertibility into sinews of war.¹ This forms the sum total of notice bestowed by Thucydides on the fine arts in the Periclean age. Among men distinguished for literary genius, Antiphon alone is mentioned; not however as founder of the Attic school of forensic eloquence, merely as a political leader and sufferer.² Such topics had not yet been recognised by the custom of the age as proper ingredients of civil history; and the strictly practical genius of Thucydides did not lead him, like Herodotus, and other writers of more excursive style, even incidentally to discuss them. But in order rightly to appreciate the enormity of that foul stain on the Hellenic character to which attention has above been called, it will be necessary to divert our minds for a moment from the Historian's battles, sieges, and diplomatic intrigues, to the theatres, gymnasia, and Lycea of the Attic metropolis. We must remember that the age of Thucydides was that in which the moral and intellectual culture of Greece, in all its principal branches, attained its perfection. We must remember that the men by whom those atrocities were enacted at Melos and Mitylene, were the same who at Athens applauded the noble maxims of justice and humanity inculcated in the verse of Sophocles, or whose minds were elevated and softened by the inspiring images of human action and suffering traced by the hand of Phidias or Polygnotus; that the men who one day dissolved in tears of sympathy for the fabulous woes of Hecuba or Polyxena, were the same who next morning deliberately voted in council for the slaughter of thousands of innocent Hellenic fellow-countrymen,

¹ II. 13.² VIII. 68.

and for inflicting on as many Hellenic widows and orphans, in the cruelest forms of reality, the bereavement and degradation so feelingly deplored in the case of those mythical heroines.

From the rare mention of prisoners of war in the Historian's descriptions of battles, it may be inferred that, as a general rule, the soldiers of a defeated army who did not escape by flight were put to the sword; and that the occasions on which it is said that quarter was given and prisoners made, were the exceptions. In confirmation of this view it may be remarked, that on several of these occasions special motives are assigned, or obviously existed, for sparing life. The most remarkable cases are the capture of 250 Corcyræans of high rank by the Corinthians¹ in the Epidamnian war, and that of the 292 Spartiates by the Athenians at Pylos.² In both cases the prisoners are expressly said to have been spared for the purpose of being turned to political account, a purpose which in both they afterwards very effectually served.³

Athens and
Sparta.

The distinctive characteristics of the two leading republics remain substantially the same in the Thucydidean as in the Herodotean period; the common deterioration being more perceptible in Athens, es-

¹ I. 54. 55.

² IV. 38.

³ III. 70., IV. 41. The estimate of loss on either side in an action is everywhere confined to the slain or prisoners. The wounded, who, from the analogy of modern warfare, ought to have been many times more numerous than the killed, are never mentioned. The omission is the more singular, that the delivery by the victor, in whose possession the field remained, of the bodies of the slain enemy, "under a flag of truce," to the heralds of the defeated army, is one of the ceremonies of war everywhere most punctually performed and recorded. Nothing is ever said of the still living sufferers. It must, however, in charity be presumed, that they were not left behind, and that their removal to a place of safety is passed over unmentioned, as being a matter of course.

pecially in regard to that "humanity" of character, by which in earlier better times she was so honourably distinguished. Her policy, though no longer generous or disinterested, is still, like the temper of her citizens, comparatively open and unsuspecting. This quality strikes the more, from its contrast with the subtle spirit of intrigue for which individual Attic statesmen are remarkable. Careless of concealment in her designs, she is rapid, vigorous, and unscrupulous in carrying them into effect; more easily elated by good fortune than discouraged by disaster, more apt to risk the success of her schemes by over-confidence, than by excess of caution. Animated by a boundless ambition, which she attempts neither to dissemble, nor to justify on any other ground than the right of the strongest, she allows no opportunity to escape of extending her power by whatever means and in whatever direction.

Sparta maintains her credit for a policy dark, double, and selfish, under a semblance of disinterestedness, which the simplicity of her social habits the better enabled her to affect. Glorifying in the narrowness of her home resources, she is the less inclined to lavish them, and her strength consists mainly in the tact with which she turns to account those of her allies. The same principle which in war withheld her from pursuing an enemy, led her to prefer an empire of political influence to one of territorial dominion. Hence it is, that in the political discussions reported in the Historian's text, we find it everywhere assumed by the orators on the Lacedæmonian side, and admitted or faintly denied by their opponents, that the Athenians were the usurpers, the Spartans the upholders, of Greek

constitutional liberty; and this, although the Athenians were the champions of democracy, and in so far, of popular rights, the Spartans of monarchy or oligarchy. The latter were however, in truth, in all cases of necessity or expediency, as peremptory as the Athenians in asserting their authority over the weaker members of their party, by the same sophistical arguments, and on the same paramount principle that might makes right.¹ But all they required was adhesion to the Lacedæmonian cause. They levied no tribute, were satisfied with good will and good service, and, so long as it was cheerfully rendered, cared little for forms of government. With the Athenians the exaction of money, in every age the most offensive mark of political supremacy, was also the most indispensable, and was carried to an excess but ill compensated, even to the popular party, by the ostensible enjoyment of the utmost amount of democratic privilege.

¹ See especially Brasidas to the Acanthians, iv. 85.

CHAP. IX.

THUCYDIDES: HIS WORK, AND ITS MATERIALS.

1. EPITOME OF THE TEXT.—2. HISTORICAL SOURCES OF THUCYDIDES. WRITTEN RECORDS. ORAL TESTIMONY.—3. HIS SPEECHES; HOW FAR AUTHENTIC DOCUMENTS.—4. HIS MYTHICAL OR TRADITIONAL MATERIALS. HIS MODE OF DEALING WITH MYTHICAL LEGEND; ITS RELIGIOUS ELEMENT.—5. EPISODE OF HIPPARCHUS AND HARMODIUS. CHRONOLOGY OF THUCYDIDES.—6. HIS WORK A MILITARY HISTORY.

BOOK I. 434—431.

1. THE Historian defines the subject of his work, as embracing the twenty-seven years' contention among the Hellenic states, commonly called the Peloponnesian war, with which he was contemporaneous, and of the vicissitudes of which he had been a careful observer. He points out the surpassing importance of this series of events, as compared with those of any other period of Grecian history; in further illustration of which opinion he concisely passes in review the more remarkable vicissitudes of the Greek race, from its origin to the close of the last great Persian war.¹

Epitome of
the text.

Reverting to his main subject, he traces the remote cause of the contest he had undertaken to describe, to the jealousy with which the growing power and ambition of Athens had inspired Lacedæmon; which latter republic had hitherto been recognised as the leading State of the Confederacy. The more immediate cause he attributes to a quarrel between Corinth and her colony Corcyra, regarding the affairs of Epidamnus, a city on the coast of Epirus, jointly founded by Corcyra and Corinth; to each of which States application had been made by contending Epidamnian factions, for aid in enforcing their several pretensions. The Corcyreans, who had not hitherto been connected with either the Athenian or the Spartan interest, solicit and obtain the alliance and support of Athens. Several engagements are fought with varied success between the Corinthian and Corcyrean fleets, in one of which an Athenian squadron takes part.²

¹ § 1—23.

² § 24—55.

In connexion with these events, Potidæa on the coast of Thrace, a Corinthian colony, but now dependent on Athens, renounces her allegiance, on the plea of oppressive treatment by the dominant state. Her cause is espoused by Corinth and by Perdiccas, king of Macedon. The Athenians defeat the combined Potidæan, Corinthian, and Macedonian force, and lay siege to the town. The part taken by Athens in these transactions, induces the Lacedæmonians, at the instance of Corinth, to convene a council of Dorian States at Sparta. It is there decided, that the "Thirty years'" truce between the rival Athenian and Dorian leagues, which had subsisted fourteen years, having been violated by Athens, is at an end.¹

In a retrospective narrative, the causes of the long existing jealousy betwixt Athens and Sparta, are traced from the capture of Sestus, the last stronghold of Xerxes on the Hellespont, to the outbreak of the now impending war. The more remarkable events of this period, the duration of which is rated by the Historian at fifty years, are, as concisely summed up in his narrative: the transfer from Sparta to Athens of the "Hegemonia," or leadership of the Greek colonial republics, owing to offence taken by them at the conduct of the Spartan commander Pausanias; their subsequent reduction by Athens, together with Eubœa, Ægina, Thasus, and other states, to the rank of tributaries; the successes of Cimon of Athens against the Persians, terminating in the great victory of the Eurymedon; the foundation of the Athenian colony of Amphipolis in Thrace; the revolt of the Messenian Helots, and their renewed subjugation by Sparta; the abortive expedition of the Athenians, in support of the native Egyptians in their efforts to shake off the Persian yoke; with several desultory wars among the Greek states, ending in the "Thirty years'" truce, the rupture of which was now at hand.²

The Lacedæmonians, in declaring war against Athens, tax her citizens with impiety, in permitting Pericles, member of a family affected by the "Cylonian bloodstain," to enjoy immunity in their city or territory. An account follows of the Conspiracy of Cylon, in which the imputed bloodstain originated. The Athenians retort on Sparta the charge of sacrilege, in her treatment of Pausanias, the victor of Platæa; whose treacherous correspondence with Xerxes, its discovery, and his subsequent

¹ 56—83.² 89—118.

death, form the subject of another retrospective episode. A third is devoted to the latter part of the life of Themistocles, as connected with the previous fate of Pausanias. Before commencing hostilities, the Spartans offer terms of accommodation; which, as involving humiliating concessions, are, at the instance of Pericles, rejected by the Athenians.¹

BOOK II. 431—428 B.C.

Six months after the battle of Potidæa, in the fifteenth year after the ratification of the "Thirty years' truce, the city of Plataea, being then at peace with all her neighbours, is suddenly, with the connivance of factious citizens, occupied by a body of Theban men at arms. The Plataeans destroy the greater part of the intruders and expel the rest. Plataea being a steady ally of Athens, while Thebes was in the interest of Lacedæmon, this event forms, with the Historian, the commencement of the Peloponnesian war. Some account is given of the States composing each division of the confederacy.²

The Lacedæmonian army invades Attica. The Athenians, by advice of Pericles, affording refuge to the rural population within the city walls, and allowing the enemy to ravage their lands, devote their whole military resources to a vigorous prosecution of maritime warfare. With a fleet of 150 ships they make reprisals on the coast of Laconia and other hostile districts. They reduce Cephallene, and, ejecting the native population of Ægina, repopulate the island with Attic colonists.

The Corinthians, with forty ships, after an abortive attempt on the coast of Acarnania, a country in alliance with Athens, are defeated with loss in a similar attempt on Cephallene.³

In the ensuing second year of the war, the Peloponnesians again invade Attica, and the Athenians again make reprisals. Athens is afflicted by a pestilence, which prevails during two years in more or less virulent form, and greatly cripples her resources.⁴

The city of Amphilocheian Argos, of which the Ambracians, a neighbouring people in the Spartan interest, had seized possession, is recaptured by the Athenian admiral Phormio, and permanently secured to the Athenian interest. Potidæa is also taken after an obstinate defence.⁵

¹ 118—146.

² 1—9.

³ 10—33.

⁴ 34—58.

⁵ 59—70.

In the ensuing third year of the war, the Lacedæmonians lay siege to Plateæ. The citizens retire to Athens, with the exception of 480 men, by whom the place is garrisoned, and successfully defended.¹

Active hostilities are continued on the coast of Thrace, and at the entrance of the Corinthian gulf, between the Athenians, with their Acarnanian allies, and the Peloponnesians, Ambracians, and other confederates of Sparta. Several naval actions are fought, chiefly to the advantage of Athens.²

The Megarians, with a small naval force under the Spartan leader Brasidas, ravage Salamis, and capture three Athenian guardships stationed off that island.³

About this time Sitalces, king of the Odrysians, with an army rated at 150,000 men, invades Southern Thrace and Macedonia, ostensibly in support of the Athenian interest in those regions. After a long and abortive series of operations he returns to his own country.⁴

The Athenians attempt the conquest of Cēniadæ, the only Acarnanian city opposed to their interest; but their operations are obstructed by the overflow of the river Achelous.

Book III. 428—425 B.C.

In the ensuing summer, the fourth year of the war, the Spartans again ravage Attica. The isle of Lesbos revolts from the Athenians, who invest and blockade Mytilene. Desultory hostilities continue on the coasts of Acarnania and Epirus. The Athenians fail in a second attack on Cēniadæ, and in one on the coast of Leucadia.⁵

In a brilliantly conducted midnight enterprise, more than half the Plateæan garrison break through the blockading Spartan lines, and effect their escape.⁶

In the ensuing fifth year of the war, the Lacedæmonians execute their customary invasion of Attica.

In Mytilene, hard pressed by the besiegers, and disappointed of relief from Sparta, the Democracy rise in arms against their leaders, and force a surrender of the place. The Athenians in council determine to put to death the whole adult male population of the city. This sentence, after a renewed debate on the ques-

¹ 71—78.

⁴ 95—101.

² 79—92.

⁵ 1—19.

³ 93—94.

⁶ 20—24.

tion, is restricted to a thousand of the citizens most hostile to the Athenian interest.¹

An Athenian force under Nicias, occupies the isle of Minoa off the port of Megara.²

The garrison of Platæa, now reduced to 225 men, enfeebled by hunger and sickness, surrender on terms, which, on casuistical pretexts, are violated, and the captives, at the instance of their old enemies the Thebans, are put to death.³

The Spartan commanders Alcidas and Brasidas, with a fleet of fifty-three sail, endeavour, by fomenting dissensions in Corcyra, to detach that island from the Athenian interest. After a fierce strife of factions, in which the Athenian and Spartan forces take part, the Athenians and the democratic party retain their ascendancy.⁴

Athens espouses the cause of the Sicilian republic of Leontini, in a quarrel with Syracuse; the Leontines being of Ionian origin, and supported by the kindred Sicilian colonies, while Syracuse ranked as head of the Siculo-Dorian interest. The Athenians send Laches with twenty ships ostensibly to the relief of their ally, but with the ulterior view of promoting Attic influence in the island. The plague reappears at Athens, and afflicts the city during another year.⁵

In the following sixth year of the war, a fleet of thirty sail is dispatched under Demosthenes, to cruise round the coasts of Peloponnesus. Another of sixty ships under Nicias, after a fruitless attempt on the isle of Melos, lands a force of several thousand men in Bœotia, where they engage and defeat the Thebans at Tanagra.⁶

Demosthenes, crossing from the Peloponnesian to the Acarnanian coast, undertakes an expedition into Ætolia, with the view of first reducing the hostile Ætolian states, and then carrying the war across the friendly territory of Phocis into Bœotia. After reducing several cities of the interior, he is overpowered by the natives, and with a small remnant of his army effects with difficulty his escape to Naupactus.⁷

The Peloponnesians, under the Spartan commander Eurylochus, supported by the Ætolians and other friendly tribes, make reprisals on the Athenian fortified positions on the Ætolian coast.

¹ 26—50.

² 51.

³ 52—68.

⁴ 69—85.

⁵ 86—90.

⁶ 91—92.

⁷ 94—98.

After an unsuccessful attempt on Naupactus, they concert measures with their Ambracian allies for an invasion of the Amphiloehian Argos.

The Athenians prosecute the war with partial success on the Sicilian and Italo-Locrian coasts. They purify the isle of Delos, and a digression of some length ensues on the early history of that island.¹

Eurylochus, reinforced by 3000 Ambraciotes, invades the Amphiloehian territory. The Acarnanians unite with Demosthenes in its defence. An engagement ensues, in which Eurylochus is defeated and slain. The Ambracians, betrayed and deserted by their Peloponnesian allies, are again attacked by the Acarnanians, and the greater part destroyed.²

The close of this year was signalled by an eruption of Mount Etna, after an interval, since the last recorded, of fifty years.³

BOOK IV. 425—422 B.C.

In the following year, the seventh of the war, the Lacedæmonians make their customary inroad into Attica. A reinforcement of forty vessels sails to the Attico-Sicilian fleet, under the joint command of Eurymedon, Sophocles, and Demosthenes, with instructions to attend also to the Athenian interests in Corcyra, again threatened by the Lacedæmonian party. Forced by stress of weather into the bay of Pylos, Demosthenes employs the ships' crews in fortifying a position on the Messeno-Laconian coast, and remains with five galleys for its protection. The remainder proceed to Corcyra.⁴

The Athenian commander Simonides obtains possession of the town and port of Eion, on the Thracian coast, but is again expelled from the place by the native powers.⁵

The Lacedæmonians, retiring from Attica, and directing their whole disposable force, naval and military, on Pylos, occupy the isle of Sphacteria in front of the Athenian position with a garrison of 420 chosen troops. Demosthenes, after repelling an attack by a greatly superior body of assailants, receives a reinforcement of forty ships. The Lacedæmonians are again defeated; the Athenians obtain command of the sea, and blockade Sphacteria. Disheartened by these reverses, the Spartan government sues for peace. The Athenians, no less elated by their success,

¹ 99—104.

² 105—115.

³ 116.

⁴ 1—6.

⁵ 7.

at the instance of Cleon propose terms so unpalatable, that the negotiation falls to the ground.¹

Desultory warfare continues, by sea and land, between the Athenian and Syracusan parties in Sicily, chiefly to the advantage of the Athenians.²

The prolonged resistance of the Sphacterian garrison creates discontent at Athens. After a warm discussion in the Council, Cleon is sent with a reinforcement of light troops, to share the command with Demosthenes. A landing is effected on the island; when, after a vigorous resistance, the survivors of the garrison, to the number of 292, surrender, and are carried prisoners to Athens. Pylos now becomes a rallying point for fugitive Helots and other Laconian malcontents, who, with the Athenian garrison, ravage the surrounding Spartan provinces.³

An Athenian fleet of eighty sail disembarks a body of troops on the Corinthian coast, who defeat the Corinthian army, occupy the bay of Methonë, and lay waste the Corinthian and Epidaurian territories.⁴

After the fall of Sphacteria, Eurymedon, sailing with his squadron to Corcyra, aids the government of that State in reducing the outlawed aristocrats, who, from fortified points in the island, carried on a destructive predatory warfare. On his departure for Sicily, the captive aristocrats are massacred by their opponents. The other Athenian enterprises on the coast of Acarnania, and elsewhere, are generally successful.⁵

In the ensuing eighth year of the war, an Athenian armament of sixty ships invades and conquers the island of Cythera; whence crossing into Laconia, the victors fortify convenient points on the coast below Sparta, and lay waste the neighbouring country. Sailing eastward, they ravage the territory of Epidaurus Limera; and destroy Thyrea, the frontier town of Lacedæmon, then held by Æginetes, on whom, when ejected from their own island by Athens, it had been bestowed by Sparta.⁶

In a general convention of Sicilian States held at Gela, it is resolved, on the proposal of Hermocrates of Syracuse, to merge their local quarrels in one bond of national defence, and renounce their foreign connexions, as injurious to the common country. On this resolution being communicated to the Athenian com-

¹ 8—23.⁴ 42—45.² 24—25.⁵ 46—52.³ 26—41.⁶ 53—57.

manders, they withdrew their force from the island; for which step they were visited with penalties by their government.¹

An Athenian force under Hippocrates and Demosthenes, aided by their partisans in the town, obtains possession, first of the long walls of Megara, afterwards of its port and castle Nisæa, and measures are taken for reducing the city. The Spartan general Brasidas, then on his way through Corinth with troops destined for Thrace, hastens to its relief. Supported by an auxiliary Theban force, he constrains the Athenians, by a skilful series of manœuvres, to abandon their late acquisitions, Nisæa alone excepted.²

After their retreat from Megara, the same two Athenian generals concert measures with the partisans of Athens in Bœotia, for the establishment of Attic influence and democratic government in the Bœotian States. The enterprise fails, through the treachery of a conspirator. Hippocrates, with the Athenian land force, succeeds in occupying and fortifying the sanctuary of Delium on the Attico-Bœotian frontier. But soon after, in a general action with the Bœotian army, he is defeated with heavy loss, himself slain, and the Athenians retire from the Bœotian territory.³

Simultaneously with these events, Brasidas, by forced marches, crosses Thessaly into the Thracian Chalcidicæ. Supported by Perdiccas king of Macedon, he obtains possession of several Athenian dependencies in that region, and ultimately of the flourishing Attic colony of Amphipolis. Thucydides (the Historian), then in command of the Athenian force in the district, hastens from Thasus to the relief of the place, but finds it already in the hands of the enemy. He anticipates however, and frustrates, the subsequent attempt of Brasidas on the naval station of Eion. The Lacedæmonian interest, under the able management of Brasidas, spreads rapidly; and many neighbouring towns are added to his conquests.⁴

In the ensuing ninth year of the war, a year's truce is agreed on between the belligerent powers; but proves only a nominal or partial suspension of hostilities. The defection of the Attico-Thracian States continues. The Athenians lay siege to Scionæ, one of their revolted towns. Brasidas, in conjunction with Perdiccas, attacks and defeats Arrhibæus, a barbarous prince of the

¹ 58—65.² 66—74.³ 76—101.⁴ 78—116.

interior. Overmatched by the combined native powers, he effects a skillful retreat. During his absence, the Athenians succeed in partially reducing their revolted Thracian vassals.¹

The Thebans capture Thespia, a Bœotian city in the Athenian interest, and raze its fortifications. In Peloponnesus a pitched battle is fought between the rival Arcadian States of Mantinea and Tegea, but without decisive result.²

BOOK V. 422—416 B.C.

In the tenth year of the war, the year's truce being now expired, Cleon takes the command of the Athenian force in Thrace, recovers several minor Athenian dependencies, and attempts the reconquest of Amphipolis. In a battle between him and Brasidas beneath the walls of that city, the Athenians are beaten, and both commanders slain.³

The Athenians, on the plea of protecting their old allies the Leontines, from the oppressive policy of Syracuse, endeavour to form a league among the Italian and Sicilian republics against the ambition of the latter State. Their overtures are favourably received in Agrigentum, Camarina, Locri, and some other smaller communities.⁴

During the winter of this year both Spartans and Athenians become more and more anxious for a permanent peace: the Athenians disheartened by their reverses in Thrace; the Lacedæmonians by the Athenian conquests on their southern coasts, and the consequent spread of desertion among the Helots. In the following spring accordingly, of the eleventh year of the war, terms were arranged between Nicias of Athens and Plistoanax king of Sparta, on the basis of each party ceding to the other all such acquisitions of cities or territory as had not been obtained by voluntary submission of the inhabitants. These terms were repudiated by four members of the Dorian league, the Bœotians, Corinthians, Eleans, and Megarians, as unfair to themselves or their dependencies. Upon this Sparta and Athens enter into a separate defensive alliance, "for fifty years;" and Sparta receives back her captive Spartiate warriors. This alliance continues nominally to subsist for upwards of six years; during which, though hostile feeling prevails, and hostilities are indirectly

¹ 117—132.

² 133—135.

³ 1—11.

⁴ 4—5.

carried on between the two States, no actual aggression is made by the one on the territory of the other.¹

At the instance of Corinth, the Argives, who had hitherto remained neutral, endeavour to form a counter-combination of Dorian states opposed to the Spartan ascendancy. This scheme is favourably regarded by the other malcontent powers; but, from disunion among its promoters, falls to the ground.² Scionē is taken by the Athenians, its adult male population slain, the women and children sold as slaves, and the forfeited lands are bestowed on Plataean refugees.

The Lacedæmonians, about the same time, make an incursion into the Mantinean territory.³

Disputes arise between Athens and Sparta, owing to the failure of the latter State to deliver up Amphipolis in terms of the late treaty. The war faction in Lacedæmon intrigue for a fresh alliance with Thebes and Corinth against the Athenians. Long and complicated negotiations ensue, with quarrels and partial hostilities from time to time between those powers, Argos, and some other States of secondary rank. In the end the war party of Athens, headed by Alcibiades, whose intrigues are opposed by Nicias, succeed in arranging, in the twelfth year of the war, "a Hundred years'" defensive alliance between Athens, Argos, Elis, and Mantinea; the previous treaties with other rival interests still continuing nominally to subsist.⁴

Early in the ensuing thirteenth year of the war, Alcibiades, at the head of a force of Athenians, Argives, and other allies, invades and ravages Northern Peloponnesus. The Argives, at his instigation, make similar incursions on the Epidaurian territory.⁵

In the following fourteenth year of the war, the Spartans and their allies, under king Agis, march against Argos. The Argives offer battle under the walls of their city; but in a conference between Agis and two Argive commanders in the Spartan interest, a four months' truce is agreed on as the basis of a future more permanent alliance. Alcibiades, remonstrating with the Argives on their fickleness, induces them to take part in an expedition of the powers hostile to Sparta against Orchomenus, an Arcadian city in her interest. Orchomenus is reduced, and Tegea, another Arcadian ally of Sparta, is attacked. Agis, with the forces

¹ 18—26.² 27—31.³ 32—38.⁴ 34—52.⁵ 52.

of the Lacedæmonian league, hastens to its relief, and in a general action fought near Mantinea, the Athenians and Argives are defeated.¹

The Eleans and Athenians occupy the territory of Epidaurus, and lay siege to the city. The Spartans again succeed in detaching Argos from the Athenian interest; and a treaty is concluded binding the two States to unite in expelling the Athenians from the Epidauris. This treaty is soon after extended into a "Fifty years'" alliance. The Athenians in consequence retire from Peloponnesus. The newly allied powers establish aristocratical government in Argos and Sicyon.²

Early in the ensuing fifteenth year of the war, the Argive democracy once more acquires the ascendancy, and repudiates the Spartan connexion. The Lacedæmonians conquer the frontier Argive town of Hysia, and massacre its adult male inhabitants.³

In the sixteenth year of the war, Alcibiades, sailing with twenty ships to Argos, carries off three hundred of the citizens most favourable to the Spartan interest, and confines them in the neighbouring small islands dependent on Argos. An Athenian armament invests the Dorian isle of Melos. Terms of submission are proposed, but rejected by the Melians; who, after a gallant defence, disappointed of succours from Sparta, surrender at discretion. The adult male population are slain, the women and children sold as slaves, and the island is repeopled with Athenian colonists.⁴

BOOK VI. 416—414 B.C.

During the winter of this year, the Athenians mature their plans for the conquest of Sicily. Some account is given of the island and its population, Greek, Carthaginian, Sicilian, and Sicanian; the Hellenic states being divided, as in the mother country, in origin and interest, between the Ionian and Dorian races.

The immediate pretext for interference was an application by the friendly republic of Segeste for protection against the Syracusans; who, after depriving the Leontines, allies of Athens, of their territory, were now, under colour of supporting the Selinuntians in a quarrel with Segeste, extending their career of usurpation into more distant parts of the island. Athenian

¹ 57—75

² 75—81.

³ 82, 83.

⁴ 84—116.

commissioners are dispatched to Sicily, to inquire and report on the prospects of local aid in the proposed enterprise.¹

Desultory warfare continues on the Argive and Lacedæmonian frontier, also in Macedonia and Thrace, on the whole to the advantage of Athens.²

Satisfied with the report of their Sicilian envoys, the Athenians in the seventeenth year of the war fit out an expedition under the joint command of Alcibiades, Nicias, and Lamachus; with instructions to support Segeste against Selinus, and to deal generally with Sicilian affairs as to them may seem expedient. Nicias, convinced from the first of the impolicy of this enterprise, argues strongly against it in the Athenian Assembly. His remonstrances are overruled by the zeal and eloquence of Alcibiades. While the armament, appointed to consist of a hundred and thirty-six galleys, with a land force of above 6000 men, was preparing for departure, the sculptured stone Hermæ, or sacred way-posts, in the streets and porticoes of the city, were, in the course of a single night, broken to pieces or defaced. No trace existed of the offenders, but suspicion fell on Alcibiades, who lay under the charge of having been formerly concerned in similar acts of sacrilege. He declares his readiness, before sailing for Sicily, to submit his case to investigation. It is however decided that he shall for the present follow out his official duties, under liability to return and take his trial at some more convenient time.³

The Syracusans, under the leadership of Hermocrates, prepare for a vigorous defence, and solicit aid from Sparta and Corinth. The Athenians, on their passage along the Italian and Sicilian coasts, are coldly received by the States professing to favour their interests, and the promises of money and supplies are found to have been delusive. Nicias, upon this, endeavours to prevail with his colleagues in command to restrict the objects of the enterprise to confirming and extending, where opportunity offered, the existing Attic influence in the island, and to return home in winter. His proposal is disapproved by his colleagues, and it is determined to prosecute the war against both Selinuntians and Syracusans.⁴

The armament meets with a friendly reception at Catana, whence predatory incursions are made into the Syracusan territory. In the meanwhile an order arrives from Athens for Al-

¹ 1—6.

² 7.

³ 8—29.

⁴ 30—50.

cibiades to return home and answer the charge regarding the Hermæ. In connexion with this affair, the Historian narrates at some length the Conspiracy of Harmodius and Aristogiton against the Pisistratidæ. Alcibiades, feigning deference to the order, sets sail in his own ship; but, landing at Thurium, absconds; and soon after takes refuge in Lacedæmon. The three hundred Argive nobles confined by Alcibiades in the islands are, with the sanction of the Athenians, massacred by the Argive democracy.¹

After some desultory operations on other parts of the Sicilian coast, the Athenians disembark their land force near Syracuse, and defeat the Syracusans in a pitched battle. They then return to Catana to await reinforcements of cavalry from Athens. Many Sicilian States of the interior espouse their cause.²

The Lacedæmonians, at the instance of Alcibiades, who points out the danger with which the Athenian schemes of conquest were pregnant to all Greece, dispatch Gylippus with immediate succours of men and ships, and promises of more.³

In the early part of the ensuing eighteenth year of the war, the democracy of Thespia rises and obtains the ascendant in that republic; but is put down by the Thebans, and its leaders take refuge at Athens.

The Athenians establish their naval station at Thapsus. With their land force they attack and carry the heights of Epipolæ, a strong position close to Syracuse, and commence the investment of the city by lines of circumvallation from sea to sea. The Syracusans, endeavouring to obstruct their project by counter-entrenchments, are worsted in several engagements, in one of which the Athenian general Lamachus is slain. The fleet now takes up its station in the inner harbour of Syracuse.⁴

Gylippus, when off Leucadia with his squadron, hearing that Syracuse was invested beyond the hope of relief, turns his attention to the Spartan interests in Italy.

The Lacedæmonians invade Argolis, and the Athenians make reprisals on the northern frontier of the Spartan territory. This was the first formal breach of the "Fifty years'" peace between the two republics; the previous hostilities on each side having been carried on under circumstances not precluded by the terms of the treaty.⁵

¹ 50—61.² 8—38.³ 88—98⁴ 94—108.⁵ 104—105.

Book VII. 414—413 B.C.

Gylippus, on receiving more certain intelligence that the defence of Syracuse was not yet hopeless, continues his voyage in that direction. Through the remissness of Nicias he sails unmolested up the straits of Messina to Himera, collects auxiliaries from that city, Gela, and other friendly republics, and, marching across the island upon Syracuse, appears before the place with 3000 men, at the moment when the citizens, hard pressed by the besiegers, were about to negotiate terms of surrender. On the day after his arrival he storms the Athenian post of Labdalum, and effects a vigorous cooperation with the besieged in obstructing the work of circumvallation. Nicias fortifies the headland of Plemmyrium on the opposite side of the harbour, and transfers thither his fleet and stores. After two land battles, in the former of which Gylippus, in the latter the Athenians are beaten, the Syracusans force the Athenians to abandon their lines of entrenchment. Fresh Peloponnesian succours arrive from time to time, and Gylippus collects further reinforcements from the Helleno-Sicilian States, who, from the epoch of this new turn of affairs, make common cause with Syracuse.¹

Nicias urgently requests large reinforcements from Athens, as indispensable to the prosecution of the siege; also that he may himself be relieved from his command, as unfit, from continued weak health, for the adequate fulfilment of his duties. The Athenians decide on a strenuous prosecution of the war, and dispatch ten ships as forerunners of an armament little less mighty than the first, about to follow under the command of Demosthenes, who is appointed colleague of Nicias. The resignation of the latter is not accepted.²

Early in the ensuing spring, the nineteenth year of the war, Agis, with a strong force, occupies and fortifies the port of Decelea in the Attic territory.³

Gylippus by land, and the Syracusans from the sea, simultaneously attack the fleet and lines of Nicias. The Athenian fleet is victorious; but Gylippus storms the Plemmyrium, and captures the stores and provisions of the enemy.⁴

Demosthenes sails from Athens with nearly a hundred galleys, and an armed force of proportional strength. A body of Thracian mercenaries, who reached Athens too late for embarkation, on

¹ 1—7.² 8—17.³ 18—19.⁴ 19—25.

their voyage back to their own country, land on the coast of Bœotia, seize on the town of Mycalessus, and massacre its inhabitants. They are themselves attacked by the Theban cavalry, and the greater part cut to pieces, or drowned in attempting to reembark. Demosthenes, after ravaging the Peloponnesian coast, and leaving part of his fleet to strengthen the Athenian squadron in the gulf of Corinth, sails into the Syracusan harbour, with seventy ships and 5000 troops, just after a general action in which the fleet of Nicias had been defeated.¹

A drawn battle is fought between the Athenian and Peloponnesian fleets in the gulf of Corinth.

After a vain attempt, by a renewal of siege operations, to penetrate the enemies' lines, the Athenians endeavour, by a midnight assault, to reoccupy their former position on the heights of Epipolæ, which by a sudden and vigorous effort are surprised and carried. But the victors advancing, flushed with success and in disorder, on the Syracusan inner defences, are in their turn routed and driven back with heavy loss on their own camp.²

This disaster, with the prevalence of epidemic disease in the army, decides Demosthenes in favour of an immediate return home. His opinion, though backed by his second in command Eurymedon, is opposed by Nicias, who feared the displeasure of his government, were the much cherished enterprise to be abandoned while a hope of success remained. Soon after, powerful reinforcements having reached the enemy, Nicias acquiesces in the view of his colleagues. Their intention is frustrated by an eclipse of the moon, which induces Nicias, on religious grounds, to insist on their departure being postponed for a lunar month.³

The Syracusans, in another action, destroy a portion of the Athenian fleet, and take measures for blockading the remainder. The Athenians attempt, in a last desperate assault, to break through the hostile barrier, but are again totally defeated. The alternative of a retreat by land alone remains. After vainly attempting to force their way among the friendly barbarous tribes of the interior, they are dispersed and in great part destroyed. Nicias and Demosthenes, with a portion of the survivors, are made prisoners; when both commanders are put to death, the latter in violation of his terms of surrender. Seven thousand captives are confined, and subjected to much cruel treatment in the Latomæ or Stone-quarry prisons of Syracuse.⁴

¹ 26—42.² 42—45.³ 46—50.⁴ 51—87.

BOOK VIII. 413—411 B.C.

The Athenians determine, with their diminished resources, manfully to prosecute the war. Eubœa, Lesbos, Chios, and Erythræ secretly apply to Sparta for assistance in shaking off the yoke of Athens. The application of the Chians is backed by Alcibiades, and by Tissaphernes, Persian satrap of Ionia, who espouses the cause of Sparta, the better to extinguish Athenian influence among the Hellenic dependencies of his own province. Overtures for a friendly connexion with Lacedæmon are also made by Pharnabazus, satrap of Æolis.¹

Early in the spring of the twentieth year of the war, the Athenians attack and disperse, near the Isthmus of Corinth, a Peloponnesian fleet destined for an attempt on Chios. Alcibiades upon this, with a small squadron, hastens to Chios, and concealing what had happened, persuades the islanders to revolt, in anticipation of the promised succours. Their example is speedily followed by the Erythræans, Clazomenians, and Milesians. A treaty of alliance for the joint prosecution of the war, is concluded between Tissaphernes and the Spartan admiral Chalcideus. The Peloponnesian fleet is subsidised by the Persian king; to whom are conceded in return all the rights formerly exercised by him over the Hellenic Asiatic republics. Lebedos, and shortly after, Methymna, Mytilene, and other Lesbian towns, renounce their allegiance to Athens. Desultory war is carried on upon the coasts and islands of the Ægæan, chiefly to the advantage of Athens.²

The Samian democracy, supported by a small Athenian force, rise against the dominant class, of whom 200 are slain, 400 banished, and their lands confiscated. Samos, under democratic government and Athenian protection, now becomes the head-quarter of the Athenian naval and military force in those seas. The brunt of the war is concentrated around the isle of Chios, which is blockaded by the Athenians. They engage the Perso-Lacedæmonians with varied success in several actions by sea and land. The isle of Rhodes, overawed by a Peloponnesian force of ninety-four galleys deserts to the Spartan interest.³

The treaty contracted between Tissaphernes and Chalcideus, and renewed with his successor Therimenes, is submitted by him to "the eleven" war commissioners, sent by the Ephori to watch

¹ 1—8.² 7—24.³ 21—44.

over the Spartan interests in Asia. They refuse to ratify the clause restoring the seignorial rights of Persia over the Greek republics; and decline receiving Persian support on such humiliating terms. About the same time Alcibiades, having quarrelled with the Lacedæmonians, attaches himself to Tissaphernes, and foment the Satrap's dissatisfaction with his Spartan allies, as a means of procuring his own restoration to his country, and former influence in her affairs. He accordingly makes overtures, which are favourably received at Athens, and by the army at Samos, for an accommodation; on condition of his bringing over Tissaphernes to the Athenian interest, and of the establishment of aristocratic government in Athens. After a long series of intrigues, on the part of Alcibiades, his confederates, and his opponents, the aristocratical party, though distrusting his intentions, complete (in the ensuing twenty-first year of war) the change of government; which consists in lodging the power of the state in an oligarchy of Four hundred.¹

In the same twenty-first year of the war, the Athenians, after an indecisive action with the Chian fleet, raise the blockade of Chios. The Athenian oligarchy establish their own form of government in their dependencies, among which Thasus immediately revolts, preferring the new constitution under the protection of Sparta, rather than that of Athens. They also, among other measures for strengthening their interest, make proposals of accommodation to king Agis, then in command at Decelea, which are coldly received.²

In the Athenian head-quarters at Samos, the democratic party, headed by Thrasybulus and Thrasyllus, reassert their superiority, repudiate the authority of the home-government, pass a decree absolving Alcibiades from all past penalties, invite him to the camp, and, on his promising his influence in obtaining a transfer of the Persian satrap's pay and alliance from the enemy to themselves, appoint him their commander-in-chief. Indignant at the proceedings of the oligarchal party at home, they meditate a descent on Athens, and a forced reestablishment of democracy; but abstain, convinced by Alcibiades of the impolicy of such a course.³

The Athenian fleet stationed at Eretria, for the protection of the Eubœan coast, is destroyed or dispersed in an action with

¹ 36—68.² 61—71.³ 72—86.

a nearly equal Peloponnesian force ; and the island revolts to the Lacedæmonians. In the panic created at Athens by this disaster, the oligarchy of Four hundred is abolished, a council of Five thousand substituted in its place, and a mission is sent to Samos with proposals for a reconciliation with Alcibiades and the army on their own terms.¹

On Tissaphernes withholding his subsidies, the Spartan Admiral Mindarus negotiates for the same amount of pay and support from the rival satrap Pharnabazus ; the Lacedæmonians agreeing to procure the revolt of the remaining Athenian dependencies in his satrapy. While engaged with his fleet in prosecuting this object, Mindarus is attacked and defeated by the Athenians near Cape Cynossema, in the Hellespont. Tissaphernes, the better to watch his own interests, sets out from the interior of his province for the seat of war, and on reaching Ephesus offers sacrifice to Diana.²

Historical
sources of
Thucydi-
des.

2. In a former part of this work it was observed, that the materials, or elementary data, for the composition of history, range themselves under the two general heads of written document and oral testimony ; and that, in order to secure the highest degree of authenticity which any historical work can possess, those materials ought, in both cases, to be derived, directly or indirectly, from contemporaneous sources. But even where an abundance of this better class of data exists, much must depend on the art of the historian who undertakes to deal with them. Testimony may be contemporaneous, without being veracious. Another indispensable requisite, therefore, of an authentic history is, that the historian, with diligence in collecting his materials, should exercise judgement in discriminating, where doubt or discrepancy exists, the more trustworthy among the mass collected, and impartiality in availing himself

¹ 91—98.

² 99—109.

of those preferred. In these several respects, whether as regards the value of its component elements or the talent of its author, a high standard of authenticity may justly be claimed for the work of Thucydides. The original data at his disposal, while belonging, with few exceptions, to the class of oral testimony, were also, with equally little exception, contemporaneous. Those bearing on his main subject, the Peloponnesian war, were necessarily of this description; the twenty-seven years over which that contest extended having coincided with the best years of his own life. Similar is the case, more or less, with his preliminary retrospect of the fifty years' interval between the defeat of Xerxes and the outbreak of the war. Thucydides was himself coeval with the latter half of that interval, and must have possessed opportunities of conversing with men whose active lives extended over the previous half.

It is abundantly clear, both from his own testimony and the internal evidence of his text, that the written authorities available for any part of his work were scanty. The half-century comprised in his retrospective narrative had, he informs us, been treated by but one previous historian, his own elder contemporary Hellanicus. But so little advantage had he derived from this author, that he assigns the imperfection of his work as an apology for having himself presented his readers with so detailed a summary of the same series of events. The only other literary data, in the proper sense, of which notice is extant, either for that period or for the Historian's own immediate subject, were the biographical memoirs of the Attic statesmen, Cimon, Thucydides, and Pericles, by Ion and Stesimbrotus; to which may be

Written
records.

added the incidental allusions by popular poets to public transactions of general interest. No reference, however, is made by Thucydides to any of these sources. Records of a public or official, as distinct from a literary character, were in those days confined chiefly to treaties of peace, many of which he has quoted in full¹, and to dedicatory or sepulchral inscriptions. Gazettes were unknown, and diplomatic dispatches unusual; confidential intelligence being commonly conveyed by the mouth of a confidential messenger. Thucydides mentions the sending of a written dispatch to the Athenian government by Nicias², when in command of the Syracusan armament, as an extraordinary expedient, only resorted to in momentous emergencies. Private memoranda, or epistolary communications, of such a nature as to possess historical value, were proportionally rare. A few documents of the latter kind are referred to by Thucydides³, but he nowhere alludes to any of the former.

Oral testimony.

He was therefore chiefly dependent for his knowledge of the events which he records, on his own personal participation in them, or on the verbal statements of others who had been more favoured with such opportunities than himself. From the commencement of the war he had formed the intention of becoming its historian, and been diligent in collecting accounts of its vicissitudes.⁴ While his talents eminently qualified him for such researches, his facilities of access to the best sources were of no ordinary description. Connected by blood with Athenian families distinguished for generations by

¹ I. 132. 134., III. 57., v. 18. 23. 47. 56., VI. 54.

³ IV. 50., VII. 8., VIII. 50: conf. I. 130. 133. 137.

² VII. 8.

⁴ I. 1., v. 26.

activity and influence in public affairs, he possessed a hereditary title to the best information which Athenian official experience could supply. He had also himself been actively engaged in the earlier operations of the war, on other occasions probably besides that which led to his disgrace. After his exile, the diminution of his opportunities at home was compensated, as he himself assures us¹, by perhaps still more varied means of observation and inquiry, which were opened to him abroad. Among the hostile or neutral republics, a distinguished Attic refugee would not fail to meet with sympathy as well as hospitality; and he seems, in several passages of his work, indirectly to intimate, that his exile had been the means of procuring him access, as a spectator, to every part of the theatre of war not immediately under Athenian influence.

The knowledge derivable from eyewitnesses, or persons immediately cognisant of events, was, for reasons elsewhere more fully stated², greater in amount and more readily acquired in those days than now. In an age when written memorials were scanty, there was greater inducement to those engaged in important enterprises, accurately to observe and carefully record the result of their observations, than in times when all that is said and done is circulated in print a few days after the event, and permanently recorded in the page of an annual register in the course of the year. Those desirous of information on transactions of public interest, rarely nowadays take the trouble of discovering some one who has borne a part in them. They are content with the written accounts. In the age of the Peloponnesian war the case was

¹ I. 22., v. 26.

² Vol. IV. p. 314. sqq.

different. The Athenians, after their Syracusan disaster, had no such documentary data to refer to for its particulars. They had nothing but the verbal reports of the survivors, who thus themselves became objects of an interest and notoriety, which would induce them sedulously to maintain and profit by their advantage. This state of things also, it is true, held out great encouragement to the spirit of fiction and exaggeration, at all times rife among the popular depositaries of rare or valuable knowledge. The task which would thus devolve on the critical inquirer, of eliciting truth from such authorities, would be much the same as now, in the parallel case of conflicting written memorials.

These considerations are necessary, to explain the singular minuteness of detail in which transactions of the most complicated nature are frequently narrated by Thucydides, not only in their outward management, but in their most secret springs and motives. Less importance here attaches to the more tangible facts which he records, to the operations of fleets and armies, or the debates of public assemblies, than to his accounts of political intrigues and negotiations, the particulars of which could not be matters of general notoriety. As examples may be quoted, the complications of diplomacy among the Dorian republics after the Treaty of Nicias¹; and the still more subtle series of similar negotiations among the Hellenic states generally, in their subsequent relations, as well to each other as to the Persian king and his satraps.² A modern historian, with the whole body of confidential correspondence, notes, and protocols, from the Foreign office, of each negotiating

¹ v. 27. sqq.

² VIII.

power, at his disposal, could hardly have presented his public with a more elaborate detail of conflicting views, difficulties, plots, and counterplots, than are here provided from private and personal communication.

Thucydides, while intimating that he had access to information from each contending interest, has nowhere specified the sources to which, in any particular case he has been indebted. There is one however which, in respect to the latter part of his narrative, suggests itself, both on grounds of probability, and from the internal evidence of his text, as more immediately within his reach, and of which, from its great value, he would the more readily avail himself. It may be presumed, that two such distinguished Athenian exiles as Thucydides and Alcibiades, were, during their banishment, on habits of intercourse or even of intimacy. They could hardly have been unknown to each other at Athens, in their earlier prosperous days; and their common disaster would promote friendly relations between them, both being members of the same moderate party in the State. Coupled with these considerations, it is remarkable that the portion of the Historian's work which contains the most copious details of political intrigue, is that descriptive of the efforts of Alcibiades to undermine the Peloponnesian interest with the Persian satraps, to substitute Attic influence in its stead, and turn this service to account in re-establishing his own sway in the Athenian councils. Many of these details are such as it is scarcely possible could have been learnt from any other than the original source, exhibiting, as they do, so thorough a familiarity with the inmost thoughts and intentions of the illustrious intriguer.

His
speeches,
how far
authentic
documents.

3. That the Historian's "speeches" were not, with rare if any exception, actually spoken in a form resembling that in which they now appear, that they cannot therefore rank as genuine historical documents, might be assumed in regard to most of them, even on their internal evidence. But the Historian himself assures us that he claims for them no such character. In his preliminary exposition of his method of historical research, he remarks ¹ that, with regard to the conferences held from time to time between rival interests, he had found it difficult, either to remember exactly what was said where he happened to be present, or to collect accurate reports from others; that he had therefore, on the basis as nearly as possible of what he knew or believed to have actually passed, worked up each address in the mode which seemed best adapted to the occasion. This amounts to a virtual admission that the speeches, in their present form, are supposititious. The utmost degree of reality which they can in any case claim, is that of comprising the substance of what was said, or may have been said, on some occasion where a certain business was discussed. But many of them can hardly pretend even to this more limited authenticity; and are probably mere rhetorical substitutes for those summaries which modern historians, Hume more especially, are accustomed in parallel cases to offer, in their own words, of the opinions or designs, of the leading personages or parties who figure on their scene of action.

The speeches of Thucydides, as the historian of contemporary events, differ from those of some of his principal imitators, in so far, that they are

¹ I. 22.

placed in the mouths of real persons, and have reference to a real state of things; so that, if no proof exists of their having been spoken, it is quite possible that they might have been. They may thus, as compared with those of some other standard antient historians, be likened to fable founded on fact, as distinct from pure fiction. The speeches ascribed by Livy to the Roman kings, or by Herodotus to Candaules, Gyges, and other early heroes of his narrative, are obviously mere specimens of their own rhetorical art. This half-historical character of the Thucydidean orations is however but a questionable merit. The fictitious matter of Herodotus or Livy cannot well be taken by any intelligent reader for more than it is worth; while the mixture of real and fictitious in Thucydides often perplexes the judgment, in the absence of any criteria for distinguishing between the two. On one occasion he makes an Athenian orator ascribe the secession of the Ionian States from the Spartan interest at the close of the Persian war, to a cause different from that elsewhere assigned by himself in his own words.¹ It is therefore fallacious to cite, as commentators are apt to do, statements contained in his speeches, as expressing his own opinions; especially where, as in the case here referred to, they seem to convey the popular tradition of the State or city to which the speaker belonged. When, in another place², the same Athenian orators describe the Attic ships at Salamis as more numerous in proportion to the rest of the fleet than they are described by Herodotus; or when we find the Theban orators³ giving a more favourable version of their conduct in the Persian war than was

¹ I. 75. 95.² I. 74.³ III. 62.

generally current in Greece, we may fairly assume, no doubt, that such was the tradition in Athens or Thebes, but not that Thucydides himself subscribed to that tradition.

The fact that many of these harangues, while dressed up in all the conventional unities of composition and delivery, as single orations, are yet described as spoken not by a single orator, but by commissions of diplomatic agents, "Athenian envoys," "Corinthian envoys," in their collective capacity, is itself conclusive proof of their unreality. It is further remarkable, that these anonymous orations, nine in number, all belong to the first seven years of the war. In those of the ensuing fourteen years, the name of the orator is mentioned. This creates the suspicion, that the introduction of orations into the text may have been an afterthought of the Historian, which first occurred to him at a late period of his undertaking; and that, in allotting an appropriate share of such matter to the earlier parts of his narrative, it may not have been easy to ascertain the name of the individual who, many years before, among some three or four Athenian, Corcyraean, or Corinthian commissioners, had acted as chief spokesman on any particular occasion. He has therefore been content, in drawing up the rights or reasons of the deputation, to ascribe the exposition of them to the whole body; whereas in more recent instances he has been able to give the name of the officiating orator.¹

¹ The Plataean defence against the Thebans (III. 52.) is placed in the mouths of two advocates, who are both mentioned by name.

Attention may also be directed to the care with which Thucydides when ushering in his speakers, seems to avoid the use of terms indi-

4. Although the main subject of the Historian's work was either contemporaneous with his own lifetime, or so recent as to admit his availing himself, in great part, of contemporaneous materials, his narrative also comprises illustrative episodes of considerable bulk, in regard to which few or no such substantial data were available. The most remarkable of these digressions are the preliminary disquisition on Hellenic antiquity, commonly entitled by antient commentators the Archæologia of Thucydides; the episode on Hipparchus; and that on the Conspiracy of Cylon. The ostensible purpose of the "Archæologia" is to prove the superior importance of his own subject, the Peloponnesian war, over any other derivable from the previous history of Greece. In order to establish this position, he examines at some length the early vicissitudes of the Greek states, with the progress of society among them prior to his own time; and arrives at the conclusion, that no former war or enterprise, either in regard to its objects or the resources brought into action, was at all to be compared with the Peloponnesian war. To the logic of this conclusion, or of his arguments in support of it, attention will be directed hereafter. For the present

His mythical or traditional materials.

cating that he gives their own words, preferring such as imply that he merely reports the substance of what was said. Those he employs are (ἐλεγον, εἶπον) τοιάδε, τοιαῦτα, τοσαῦτα; "(they spoke) in this manner, to this effect:" never τάδε, ταῦτα, or others equivalent to our own expressions "in these words," or "as follows."

Add to this the prophetic import of some of the earlier speeches; that of Archidamus for example (I. 80.); where the character and vicissitudes of the war about to be waged, its great length and obstinacy, the peculiar policy of Athens as prescribed by Pericles (I. 140., II. 13.), and the alliance between Sparta and Persia against Athens, are alluded to in terms plainly reflecting the experience rather than the mere foresight of the orator: compare I. 33—36., iv. 60. sqq.

we confine ourselves, in illustration of his method of research, to the value attached by him in this remarkable dissertation, to the fabulous records of early national history.

His mode
of treating
mythical
tradition.

It is evident that the strictures pronounced at the close of the "Archæologia," on the uncritical preference awarded by preceding historians to mythical tradition over real history, are directed not so much at the intrinsic value of the traditions preferred, as at the mode in which they were treated. The tenor of this whole introductory chapter shows Thucydides to have been himself a believer in the fundamental truth of those traditions. What he censures in the logographers is their want of discrimination in separating the kernel of real fact from the mythical husk in which it is enveloped. A great part accordingly of his "Archæologia" is occupied with speculative distinctions between these two component elements of mythical history. The principle on which he proceeds differs from that sanctioned by the sounder research of our own age. He neither believes in the preternatural ingredient of fable, nor attempts, like the more subtle interpreters of his own time, to convert fiction into fact by the allegorical mode of exposition. He discards the supernatural ingredient altogether. But here his rational scepticism ends, and he lapses himself into the credulity which he censures in others, by assuming the possible or human element, when relieved of its mythical appendages, to be necessarily real or historical. The more cautious modern inquirer is content, in the first instance, with conceding the possibility of such reality. Its positive existence he only assumes, where sustained by the test of other collateral evidence, the nature or value of

which, in the rare instances where it exists, we have endeavoured in another place¹ to define.

For example, the modern speculative critic admits the Trojan series of poetical legend to possess reality, in so far as shadowing forth a great contest between the races of the eastern, and those of the western shore of the Ægæan, with the conquest and colonisation by the latter of a portion of the hostile territory. This much he assumes to be true, or at least probable; because the fact of Greek tribes being found in historical times settled in those regions, as conquerors among alien races, coupled with the inveteracy of the tradition itself, and the relation in which it stands to the subsequent course of more authentic history, form as strong a body of speculative evidence as can reasonably be required in any such case. With regard to the individual persons or events of the Iliad, the rape of Helen or the ten years' siege, he commits himself to no positive decision how far they may have been real, how far the creations of poetical fancy.

The method of Thucydides is different. His scepticism is limited to the superhuman element of the legend. The human or possible element he adopts as fact, reserving to himself the privilege of moulding that fact into forms which appear to him more consistent with probability, than those in which it has been shaped by the popular authorities. He believes not only in a conquest of the Troad by Hellenic warriors, but that Agamemnon (allowance being made for poetical enlargement) besieged Troy during ten

¹ See Vol. I. B. i. Ch. ii., Vol. iv. p. 318. sqq.; and the author's "Remarks on two Appendices to Grote's History, &c.," Longmans, 1851; also in Appendix N. to Vol. III. 2nd edit.

years with the amount of force described in the *Iliad*. Homer's 1200 ships are with him as genuine an armament as the 300 that sailed under Nicias to Sicily; and he estimates the number of warriors conveyed, by striking an average between the maximum and minimum strength of the several ships' companies, as given by the poet. But he differs from Homer as to the real cause of the war. He questions the fact of the expedition having been undertaken by the Greeks from personal regard for the Atridæ. He considers it more likely to have been forced on them by Agamemnon, as head of a great federal empire which he was desirous of extending. He doubts the possibility of so large an army having been in that age able to procure, from ordinary sources, the supplies necessary for carrying on siege operations during ten years. He assumes that a part of the host was employed in agriculture on the opposite Thracian coast, raising annual crops for the subsistence of the camp; while another part was engaged, for the same object, in piratical adventure. A similar method is applied to other chapters of mythology. Minos is a genuine Cretan king, the first founder of a naval empire in the Mediterranean¹, by the colonisation of the Ægæan isles, and the extirpation of the pirates by whom they were infested. The legends of Theseus and the Cecropidæ are in like manner converted into authentic histories. Nor does he appear to recognise any lines of distinction between the more or less fabulous or poetical, and the more or less historical or real, in the tradition of different periods; such as later authors have established in the several epochs of the Theban and Trojan wars, the Dorian conquest of

¹ I. 4; 8.

Peloponnesus, and the Olympic solemnity. Pelops, Minos, Theseus, Agamemnon, Aminocles the Corinthian shipbuilder, Pisistratus, Themistocles, are all equally, in so far as the acts or adventures recorded of them are of a real or possible nature, themselves admitted to rank as historical personages.

Thucydides has nowhere explained the nature or amount of the evidence which he considered necessary, in any particular case, to entitle popular legend to rank as history. The only authority cited by name regarding mythical times is Homer; and slightly as he speaks of poets and mythographers where their own historical criticism is in question, it is certain that to the same poets and mythographers he must have been indebted for the whole, or by far the greater part, even of such reality as he claims to have extracted out of mythical legend. On one occasion alone he seems to appeal, though vaguely, to another class of data. The concise abstract which he gives, in the "Archæologia," of the history of the Pelopidæ from the settlement of Pelops in Greece to Agamemnon, is said to be borrowed from "the more accurate organs "of Peloponnesian tradition."¹ Who these "more accurate" authorities were he does not inform us. Nor does it appear in what the greater accuracy ascribed to them may have consisted. But the remark shows that he found room for critical discrimination even in such purely legendary matters.

Thucydides has not thought it necessary to extend his speculations on fabulous tradition to its more strictly theological element, to the influence exercised by the national deities, through oracles, omens, or otherwise, on the conduct of human affairs, either in

Religious
element of
mythology.

¹ I. 9.

mythical or historical times. The rare and brief allusions to religious matters in which he anywhere indulges, imply that if not an actual atheist, as seems to have been a common opinion with his native public¹, he was at least a thorough freethinker. He nowhere directly intimates either belief or disbelief in a deity. But he does not disguise his indifference to, or contempt for, the modes in which the deity was personified, or his power supposed to be exercised, in the popular Pantheon. Such being his own views, his mode of dealing with religious topics is creditable both to his judgement and his taste, and is marked by the same impartiality which pervades his general narrative. The more eccentric his opinions, the less he has been at pains to obtrude them on his readers. The gods or goddesses are seldom named at all. In mentioning oracles or prophecies, when his subject happens to force them on his notice, he treats them at times very plainly as impostures, or as delusive.² But nowhere does his tone of incredulity amount to actual scoffing. He allows indeed in one case that a prediction had proved true, that regarding the twenty-seven years' duration of the Peloponnesian war.³ In other instances he seems to admit, if not so palpable a fulfilment as was claimed by vulgar interpreters, a certain coincidence between the prophecy and the event.⁴ He remarks however, in reference to such cases of partial fulfilment, on the ambiguity of terms by which the framers of oracular edicts endeavour to secure their verification.⁵ He contrasts in a sarcastic tone⁶, the cala-

¹ Antyllus ap. Marcell. § 22.

² v. 16., v. 103., II. 21., II. 47., II. 8., I. 126.

³ I. 118., II. 54.

⁴ II. 17., II. 54.

⁵ v. 25.

⁶ VIII. 1.

mitous result of the Syracusan expedition with the brilliant prospects of success held out by the soothsayers at the time of its departure. He evidently considers eclipses, and other natural phenomena, which the habit of the age turned to superstitious account, to be owing to natural causes. While showing no sympathy with the notion of their exercising, either as warnings, or omens of impending occurrences, influence on the course of events, he yet remarks, in guarded and ambiguous terms, on the number of such phenomena during the Peloponnesian war, as a fact which might almost seem to justify the belief, otherwise "so little borne out by experience," of some connexion in this particular instance, between them and the more striking vicissitudes of human destiny.¹

5. The most important chapter of historical, as distinct from mythical legend, in his narrative, is the episode of Hipparchus and his destroyers. Thucydides here differs from the popular Attic tradition, in denying the two friends to have been instigated to their vaunted tyrannicide by patriotic devotion. He describes it as a simple act of assassination from motives of personal resentment. The main object however of the digression, is to point out what he considers the vulgar error regarding the order of primogeniture, and consequent succession to tyrannical power, in the usurping family.² This is the only case in which he appeals in support of his views to

Episode of
Hipparchus.

¹ I. 23. : conf. Ch. viii. p. 61. *supra*. The other kinds of prophetic agency, Dreams, Prodigies, Aruspicy, &c., which occupy so large and honourable a place in the pages of Herodotus and Xenophon, find none whatever in those of Thucydides.

² VI. 54. On the validity of his argument see Appendix B.

inscriptions on contemporaneous public monuments. His account of the Cylonian conspiracy is the same in substance as that given by Herodotus. The difference in the details reflects probably a variety in the popular tradition, with each, it may be presumed, the only source of information on the subject.

Chrono-
logy of
Thucy-
dides.

The work of Thucydides labours under the defect, common to the historical literature of his time, of being unprovided with any standard chronological era for the adjustment of dates. In regard to his own subject he has endeavoured to make good this want, by a system of computation of a simple and intelligible nature as far as it goes, that by years of the war which he describes. It is one however, the benefit of which is limited to the vicissitudes of his narrative in their relation to each other. It affords no help in connecting their dates with those of previous history. For this purpose he resorts occasionally to other remarkable epochs. He informs us, for example, that the occupation of Plataea by the Thebans, which event forms with him the commencement of the Peloponnesian war, took place in the fifteenth year of the Thirty years' peace contracted between Sparta and Athens after the Athenian conquest of Eubœa; in the fifty-first year after the taking of Sestus by the Athenians, which with him, as with Herodotus, forms the close of the Persian war; in the forty-eighth official year of Chryseis, eponyme priestess of Juno Argiva; under the ephorship of Ænesias in Sparta, and the archonship of Pythodorus in Athens.¹ The epoch of the peace of

¹ II. 1.: conf. I. 118. The notices of Olympiads and Olympic victors in III. 8. and v. 49., are introduced not as chronological dates, but merely in their incidental connexion with historical facts.

Nicias (421 B.C.) is also specified by reference to the ephorship and archonship of that year.¹ The destruction of Plataea by the Spartans in the fifth year of the war, is placed ninety-three years after the first formation of the alliance between that State and Athens.² Other more widely retrospective dates are that of the foundation of Melos³, seven hundred years prior to its destruction by the Athenians in the sixteenth year of the war; that of Aminocles the Corinthian ship-builder⁴, three hundred years prior to the close of the war, or in 704 B. C. ; that of the first recorded Greek naval action, fought between the Corinthians and Corcyraeans, two hundred and sixty years prior to the close of the war, or 664 B.C.⁵; that of Lycurgus, or at least of the existing Spartan constitution, upwards of four hundred years prior to the same epoch⁶; and that of the Sicilian migration into Sicily, three hundred years prior to the first settlement of Greek colonies in the island.⁷ The date of that settlement, laid down as 736 B.C. in the received chronology, is not specified by Thucydides. Of the principle on which these wider computations proceed, the Historian has given no explanation. The epochs of the first colonisation of Melos and of Sicily carry us back into the remote mythical age.

6. The work of Thucydides has been justly entitled by its author "A history of the war between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians." The narrative, with rare exception, is devoted either to martial enterprises, or to civil affairs so nearly connected with them, as to render a certain knowledge of the

His work
a military
history.

¹ v. 25.

² III. 68.

³ v. 112.

⁴ I. 13.

⁵ I. 13.

⁶ I. 18.

⁷ I. 2.

one class of transactions indispensable to a right understanding of the other. To the home politics either of Athens or Sparta no attention is paid purely on their own account. The modifications of constitutional government in either republic, affecting the democratic principle of the one or the aristocratic principle of the other; the influence which political faction exercised on the general course of events or the condition of society,—matters which the modern historian esteems not less important than wars waged between rival powers,—are passed over unnoticed, or mentioned but incidentally, in their connexion with military undertakings or foreign diplomacy. The Historian's silence on such subjects is perhaps more remarkable in his introductory retrospect of the fifty years prior to the outbreak of the war, than in his principal narrative. The changes which the Athenian constitution, and with it the temper and habits of the citizens, underwent during that half-century, chiefly through the agency of Pericles as head of the democratic party, were among the fundamental causes of the state of things which led to the war, and which it is the object of the retrospect to explain. Here however, as elsewhere, he is content with recording the jealousies and quarrels of the separate States among themselves, or with the common Persian enemy. The two most eminent statesmen of the age, Cimon and Pericles, who during that period in their turn swayed the destinies of Athens, are mentioned but rarely, and solely with reference to their military achievements. Of their relative position and conduct as rival leaders we hear nothing. A long episode is devoted to the closing years of the life

of Themistocles; but this mark of distinction is limited to his foreign adventures. Of his political position at home, nothing more is said than that, at the date when the episode commences, "he was "residing under the ban of ostracism at Argos." Neither Herodotus nor Thucydides, much as they were interested in the fortunes of this illustrious Athenian, have explained the cause of his exile.

The notices from time to time of political revolutions in the secondary States of the Confederacy, in Corcyra, Samos, Argos, form no real exception to the general rule; the transition from democratic to aristocratic government in those States, being in every case either the cause or the consequence of the fluctuating fortunes of the war, of the alternate ascendancy of Spartan or Athenian influence. Another more valid case of exception might seem to be the detailed account, in the eighth book, of the overthrow of democratic government at Athens. But here also, the whole series of intrigue and revolution originated with the army, anxious, amid the increasing difficulties of their foreign service, to restore Alcibiades to power, as the only means of breaking up the coalition between the Lacedæmonians and Persians, which had turned the tide of success against them. And throughout the ensuing narrative, the vicissitudes of military enterprise and political intrigue are inseparably connected. Had the same changes been originally planned and carried into effect in the Council of Athens rather than in camp at Samos, and had the army, as in ordinary times, acquiesced in them, they would not probably have been honoured with any similar share of attention.

This restriction of the principal subjects of historical narrative to military enterprise and foreign politics, is a feature not peculiar to the historical art of Thucydides, but common to that of his age. Herodotus enlarges no doubt at times on the internal government and statistics of the countries which he describes; but these portions of his text are devoted alone or chiefly to foreign regions, and are hence of a geographical rather than a political character. Such notices, where bestowed on Grecian politics, are with him, as with Thucydides, brief or inexplicit. The student of Grecian history would look in vain to either author for even a general outline of the Athenian or the Spartan constitution. The cause of this deficiency in early historical literature is to be sought, partly in the origin of that branch of composition, partly in the political state of Greece. Narratives of events are in every age more congenial to the taste of popular readers than commentaries on laws and institutions. It must also be remembered that a History of Greece at this period was not that of a single State, under a single central government, but of a number of rival communities, each with its own separate constitution. To have given even an abridged account of these numerous forms of polity, would have gone far to convert a history from a narrative of facts into a collection of commentaries on the theory of government. An exception, it may perhaps be thought, might with propriety have been made in the case of Athens and Sparta, as constituting, especially during the Peloponnesian war, each with its separate league of States, integral bodies politic, similar to the great powers of the modern European system. This con-

sideration would no doubt have its weight with the modern critical historian. With the native author, the superior distinction of those two republics, by rendering their institutions matters of more general notoriety, especially to the contemporaneous public for which Thucydides wrote, seems to have diminished rather than augmented their claim to particular attention. But although this element of historical research was overlooked by historians in the proper sense, it does not seem to have been altogether neglected in the literature of the time. There can be no doubt that the notices of internal Athenian politics during the Cimonian and Periclean periods, by Plutarch and other later authorities, were derived from original sources, partly from treatises on civil government, partly from other miscellaneous branches of historical composition, which attained a certain stage of maturity in the time of Thucydides.

What has here been said of forms of government, applies also to the state of social culture generally in art, literature, and science. The importance of these subjects was undoubtedly well appreciated in Greece from the Periclean age downwards. None of them had however as yet established a claim to even an episodical share of notice in the higher departments of historical composition.

CHAP. X.

THUCYDIDES: HIS WORK, ITS COMPOSITION AND STYLE.

1. PLAN OF THE NARRATIVE. ITS POWER, SPIRIT, AND TRUTH. DEFECTS OF ITS EPIC ECONOMY.—2. CAMPAIGNS OF DELIUM AND AMPHIPOLIS. PYLIAN CAMPAIGN OF DEMOSTHENES. INTRODUCTORY PART OF THE WORK.—3. ITS EPISODES. HARMODIUS AND HIPPARCHUS.—4. THE "ARCHÆOLOGIA" OF THUCYDIDES.—5. HIS DELINEATION OF CHARACTER. PERICLES.—6. NICIAS. ALCIBIADES. BRASIDAS. CLEON.—7. HIS SPEECHES, AS ILLUSTRATIVE OF CHARACTER. SPECULATIVE OR DIDACTIC ELEMENT OF THE WORK.—8. STYLE OF THUCYDIDES IN THE NARROWER SENSE.—HIS NARRATIVE STYLE. EPISODE OF THEMISTOCLES.—9. HIS RHETORICAL STYLE. ITS DEFECTS. ITS MERITS.—10. HIS SUPPOSED DISCIPLESHIP UNDER GORGIAS AND ANTIPHON. HIS DIALECT. OTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF HIS ORATORY.—11. FUNERAL ORATION OF PERICLES.—12. OTHER SPEECHES. RHETORICAL STYLE IN THE NARRATIVE PARTS OF THE TEXT. HIS DESCRIPTION OF BATTLES. OF THE PLAGUE AT ATHENS. CONCLUSION.

Plan of the
narrative.

431 B.C.

421 B.C.

1. THE Peloponnesian war, while defined and treated by Thucydides as one great epic subject, to the unity and grandeur of which he has everywhere shown himself alive, has with equal propriety been divided by him, or may rather be said to divide itself, into three parts or periods. The first period comprises ten years of continued hostilities, extending from the invasion of Plataea by the Thebans to the so-called Peace of Nicias. During the seven years which ensued, negotiations interrupted or accompanied, but never entirely superseded, military action. Some of the States, discontented with the terms arranged for them by their leaders, evaded the suspension of arms, or quarrelled afresh among themselves. Nor was the nominal

peace between Sparta and Athens attended by any mitigation of unfriendly feeling. Both were, during the whole time, not only engaged in plotting against each other, but were habitually brought into collision in the field, in the great battle of Mantinea for example, fighting on opposite sides, as partisans of their belligerent allies. Still, as no actual breach occurred of the strict letter of the treaty between the two leading powers during this septennial period, it was not in their case considered a state of war. Another ten years of undisguised warfare followed, making up the whole twenty-seven of the Historian's reckoning, and terminating with the fall of Athens. But the narrative of Thucydides breaks off with the battle of Cynossema, in the twenty-first year. He designates the whole twenty-seven years "The war between the Athenians and Peloponnesians." The more concise and now familiar term of "Peloponnesian war" has not been used by him. The first ten years of continued hostilities are occasionally called the First war.¹ The ensuing seven years are characterised as the period of Respite.² The subsequent decennial course of continuous warfare is styled generally the Latter war.³ He has also designated certain more remarkable portions of each decennial period by separate names, as the Epidaurian, Mantinean, Sicilian, Ionian wars.⁴

¹ v. 20. 24. 26., vi. 6., vii. 18.

² v. 26.

³ v. 26. : conf. iv. 81.

⁴ v. 26., vii. 27. 85., viii. 11. The first decad is called by Lysias the Archidamian war, as having been declared by Archidamus king of Sparta; the last decad, by Isocrates, Demosthenes, and commonly by antient writers, in its integrity the Decelean war. Other separate names have been given to separate parts or campaigns of each; such

Its power,
spirit, and
truth.

This memorable series of events has been treated by Thucydides with a precision, a penetration, and an impartiality, which have justly obtained for him the highest rank, not only among the more critical historians of antiquity, but among those of our own more enlightened age. In our remarks on the materials of his work, full justice has already been done to the extent and value of his research. The testimony borne by the native public to his fidelity and impartiality, which has been cordially seconded by modern critics, has been well summed up in the words of the antient grammarian who has given the most elaborate analysis of his work, and by whom the less favourable points of its composition have been most severely censured. "It is agreed," says Dionysius of Halicarnassus, "among critics of all classes, if not unanimously, by at least a great majority of voices, that "Thucydides possesses in an eminent degree that "highest quality of a historian, a strict regard for "truth; that in his statements he neither adds to, "nor subtracts from, the genuine substance of facts "or events; is never drawn by personal feeling or "prejudice to give a false colouring to their details; ". . . that in regard to every practical end or object "of historical research his method is excellent, and "worthy of all imitation; but in this, above all, that "he never wilfully deceives his readers, or tampers "with the purity of his own conscience."¹ Passages have already been noticed, which appear to form

as "Pachetian" war to the campaign under Paches against Mitylene. See the ingenious essay of F. W. Ullrich, *Beyträge zur Erklärung des Thucydides*, p. 12. sqq.

¹ Dionys. Hal. *De Thucyd.* Jud. § 8.

partial or venial exceptions to the terms of this unqualified encomium; but in its justice, as a general rule, every critical student of his work must cordially acquiesce.

While the approbation bestowed on the matter of the work has been as universal as well merited, the manner of its composition, whether in regard to the general conduct of the narrative, or to special peculiarities of style, has furnished commentators of every age with an ample arena for exceptional criticism.

The narrative is throughout sustained and vigorous, often brilliant and powerful. But in its mechanical arrangement, or, as styled by the old critics, its "economy," he has hardly done justice to the intrinsic value of his materials. The order which he has preferred may be defined the chronological, as distinguished from the epic or historical order; the narrative being distributed, not so much with regard to its principal groups or masses of events, as to the years or other conventional periods of time in which those events happened. This method has, no doubt, its advantage in some cases. It is well adapted to historical compendia, drawn up for the purpose of reference rather than continuous perusal, as affording more immediate facilities of access to particular facts or dates. But the vicissitudes of a great and united epic action, such as the Peloponnesian war, to be rightly appreciated, require to be freely treated in their own just connexion of cause, effect, and influence, not in any servile dependence on conventional divisions of time. Nor has Thucydides been content with the more simple form of

Defects of
its epic
economy.

annalistic arrangement, where entire years suffice as the common measure of time and action. He enforces a further subdivision by semestrial seasons, summers and winters¹; involving a further sacrifice of unity in the principal masses of the narrative. Where, for example, some remarkable enterprise happens not to be completed within a single season, instead of being followed out either to its close, or, when of great length, to some appropriate stage of its progress, it is brought with the close of the season, perhaps in the very acme of its interest, to a standstill, until the author has led up to the same point of time the arrear of other transactions, however unimportant, which had been in like manner commenced and broken off. He then, with the opening of the ensuing season, reverts to the first in the previous order of interruption, and brings it down either to its own conclusion, or to the point where the end of that season again cuts it asunder; and so on with the remainder. This process, in the parts of the work where it is carried to excess, not only mars the epic unity of the narrative, but tends, by distracting the mind of the reader, to defeat the object which the Historian seems to have had in view, that of securing distinctness to the parts of his subject. It would be unreasonable to insist that each integral portion of a long narrative should in all cases, when once commenced, be carried on in uninterrupted continuity to its close. That would be

¹ The more minute specification of dates, by reference to days of the month, seems not to have been customary in the historical works of this period; although it occurs in the treaties of peace quoted by Thucydides, and in contemporaneous inscriptions.

an error in the opposite extreme, converting history into a disjointed series of historical memoirs. All that is here required is, that the author, unfettered by any formal restraints, should give free scope to his own discretion, in working up every part of his subject in the manner most conducive to its own effect, and that of his whole composition.

2. In illustration of this defect may be cited the account of two remarkable undertakings which signalled the eighth year of the war: the attempt of the Athenian commanders Demosthenes and Hippocrates on Bœotia, ending in the defeat and death of the latter at Delium¹; and the campaign of Brasidas in Thrace, ending in the conquest of Amphipolis.²

Campaign
of Delium
and Am-
phipolis.

In the early part of the year, the two Athenian generals concert measures with malcontent States of Bœotia, for the invasion of that country. The plans of attack are arranged, the troops and ships collected at appropriate points, and their destinations fixed. But before operations commence the summer ends. We are therefore transported to Thessaly, where we find Brasidas ready with his force to cross that country into the Thracian Chalcidicæ. Thither accordingly we accompany him; and his conquests of Acanthus and other fortresses of that district are described. But here again his summer operations terminate, and we are carried back to Bœotia, where the Athenian enterprise is, with the winter, resumed and concluded. After disposing of some subordinate business in other quarters, the Historian returns

¹ IV. 76. sqq.

² IV. 78. sqq.

to Brasidas, and brings down his campaign to the achievement which forms its climax of success. Every reader must be sensible how much the narrative of these two enterprises would gain in interest as well as elegance, had each been described from beginning to end without interruption. Both are of moderate length; each is united and compact in its own epic integrity, and quite independent of the other. There is therefore no conceivable reason for so much travelling backwards and forwards between the two, except the rigid law imposed on himself by Thucydides, of carrying no portion of his subject in connected order beyond the term of a single summer or winter season.

The Ætolo-Ambracian campaign of Eurylochus, the most striking enterprise of the sixth year of the war, offers another instance of a similarly united historical action, similarly cut in twain, and with like detriment to its just historical effect.¹

Pylian
campaign
of Demo-
sthenes.

This over-subtle sense of chronological exactness manifests itself at times even within the limits of a single season. The Pylian campaign of Demosthenes², certainly one of the most compact, as well as striking enterprises of the war, and which, setting aside the defect here in question, has been admirably described, was begun and brought to a close in the course of the seventh summer. The Historian therefore was, in so far, free from his self-imposed obligation to chequer its details with those of other contemporaneous events. Yet no sooner has he thoroughly fixed our attention and warmed our interest by informing us, that so great was the alarm

¹ III. 100. sqq.

² IV. 2. 8. 26.

created in Lacedæmon by the boldness and energy of the Attic commander's measures, as to cause the sudden recal of the Spartan army from before Athens for the defence of the home territory, than we are transported to Thrace, to attend to another extraneous and little important matter. We then resume the interrupted narrative, with the arrival of the Spartan troops at Pylos. But on its reaching another momentous stage, it again breaks off, and gives place to a long report of desultory naval operations on the coast of Sicily; after which, we are at last permitted to follow out the Historian's brilliant account of Athenian success and Lacedæmonian disaster, in uninterrupted continuity to its close.

With the siege of Syracuse, the narrative assumes a greater degree of epic unity; all other events being made subordinate to the progress of that fatal catastrophe.

This defect in the "economy" of his work, shows Thucydides to have been comparatively wanting in that finer epic faculty, by which Herodotus was distinguished. His preference however of the strictly chronological mode of treatment has been limited to his main subject. To his introductory narratives, where that mode, if judiciously applied, might have been really desirable, he has endeavoured to impart epic relief, by the expedient which grammarians define as "plunging in medias res." This expedient consists in opening the account of a series of events, not with its proper commencement, but at some more or less advanced stage of its progress; in carrying it on from that point to some convenient halting-place; in then reverting to the early part of the series, and

Introductory part of the work.

bringing it down, in the mode of retrospect, to the middle point whence we originally started. Whatever may be the merit of this device, when applied in the proper place and manner by Homer, Herodotus, or other skilful masters of the epic art, it has not been successful in the present instance. The ostensible object of the Historian's fifty years of preliminary narrative¹, is to trace the causes of the great contest which he had undertaken to record. He divides those causes into two classes: the more immediate and obvious, and the more remote and less apparent causes.² He limits the operations of the former class to the four years from the outbreak of the Epidamnian quarrel to the Spartan declaration of war; the operation of the latter he extends from the taking of Sestus (or close of the Persian war), to the Epidamnian quarrel. He treats each class separately, but reverses the order of time in the order of treatment. We have first an immediate retrospect to the main narrative, describing the events from Epidamnus to the Declaration of war³; and then another retrospect, supplementary to the previous retrospect, describing the events from Sestus to Epidamnus.⁴ The advantage of this division and transposition of preliminary matter we have never been able to perceive; while its disadvantages, in disturbing the course of a naturally simple and united story, are very obvious. The impropriety is the greater, that the retrospect from Epidamnus to the Declaration of war (the last in order of time, the first in order of arrangement), is treated in as ample detail as any subsequent part of the principal subject. We

¹ I. 23—117.² I. 23.³ I. 24—88.⁴ I. 89—117.

are hence led to imagine ourselves already engaged in the full stream of events, to be carried on with like fulness in the sequel. The more out of place and out of date appear the sudden spring backwards in i. 89. to the history of Greece fifty years before, and the sudden transition from the previous detailed narrative to a meagre summary of transactions with which, in so far as involving the primary causes of the state of things already described, we ought to have been made acquainted in the first instance.¹ Had Thucydides, after informing us (i. 23.) that the Peloponnesian war originated in the steady increase of Athenian power during the previous fifty years, and the consequent jealousy and alarm of Sparta, described in its natural order the progress of Attic aggrandisement and Spartan mistrust, down to the

¹ There is here an evident analogy, it can hardly be called resemblance, between the method of Herodotus and that of Thucydides, in the preliminary parts of their works. Each has an introductory "Archæologia," and two retrospective narratives. The opening disquisition by Herodotus on the origin of the national enmity between Hellene and Barbarian which resulted in the Persian war, tallies with the opening disquisition by Thucydides on the mythical enterprises of the Hellenes, as compared with the Peloponnesian war. The two Retrospects of Herodotus, the one on the affairs of Lydia prior to the reign of Croesus (which reign he defines as the commencement of his main subject, i. 5.), the other on the history of Central Asia prior to Cyrus, correspond to the double Retrospect of Thucydides on the affairs of Greece prior to the commencement of his main subject. In epic propriety of effect these passages of Herodotus have the advantage. Unlike the single series of events, unnecessarily cut in twain and complicated by Thucydides, they form two separate historical streams, originating in different sources, and pursuing each its independent course to its confluence with the affairs of the Hellenic world. The parallel therefore is not complete in the details. It is however such in all the main features of the two cases, as to warrant the suspicion that Thucydides may here have emulated, however imperfectly, the method of Herodotus; and adds consequently to the evidence elsewhere adduced, that he knew the work of his predecessor.

actual outbreak of hostilities, augmenting the precision of his narrative as the plot thickened and the sources of animosity increased, this whole portion of his work would have gained both in distinctness and elegance. Other examples might be adduced of undue complication of the natural course of the narrative in its introductory stages.¹

Episodes. 3. The Episodes of Thucydides, if not always strictly to the purpose, or introduced in the happiest manner, are yet among the most valuable parts of his work, as well from their historical interest and spirited style, as from the light which they reflect on the genius of their author.

There are in all seven passages of the History which can properly rank as episodes, or, in other words, digressions of a certain length, on topics extraneous to, but connected with, the principal narrative. These are: I. On the Conspiracy of Cylon²; II. On the last days and death of Pausanias³; III. On the last days and death of Themistocles⁴; IV. On the institutions of Theseus and early statistics of Athens⁵; V. On the festival of Apollo at Delos⁶; VI. On the settlement of Alcmaeon in Acarnania⁷; VII. On the death of Hipparchus and the expulsion of the Pisistratidæ.⁸

The purposes for which episodes are commonly introduced, are: first, that of extending and illustrating, secondly, that of adorning the principal subject. They may also, it is obvious, combine both these objects, and in so far as the one or the other predominates, may be classed as Historical or as Ornamental. Another less legitimate purpose, which

¹ Appendix F.² I. 126.³ I. 128.⁴ I. 135.⁵ II. 15.⁶ III. 104.⁷ II. 102.⁸ VI. 54.

in the case of Thucydides requires to be noted, is that of inculcating favourite opinions of the author on points in which he happens to take a peculiar interest. These episodes might be classed under a third denomination, of speculative or controversial.

Of the Episodes in the above list, the first four are of the properly historical order. The fifth and sixth partake more of the ornamental, the seventh largely of the controversial character. With the exception of the sixth, they are all, whatever the object of their introduction, in so far historical, that they illustrate events of historical interest. All possess great merit of literary composition; comprising most of the beauties and few or none of the defects of the author's style. Those on Pausanias and Themistocles supply from the most authentic source, what would otherwise have been serious blanks in the biography of these two remarkable men. The detailed account of the Cylonian conspiracy is also a welcome supplement to the brief notice of that adventure in Herodotus. The digressions on the antient state of Attica, and on the isle of Delos, if less apposite in a historical point of view, possess their own share of interest, as specimens of the antiquarian research of their author. The joint notice in No. VI. of the physical and poetical geography of Acarnania, while appropriate in itself, also claims attention as one of the rare occasions on which Thucydides has deigned to dwell on purely mythical subjects, or on which, as the antients by a quaint figure were used to express it, "the Lion has deigned to laugh."

The most defective Episode of the seven, if judged by what must always be a primary test of merit,

Episode of
Hipparchus and

Harmodius.

the aptness of its connexion with the main subject, is that descriptive of the death of Hipparchus, and the subsequent dethronement of his brother Hippias. In historical value or interest, this digression is no way inferior to those concerning Pausanias and Themistocles; being the earliest detailed account which we possess, and from the most critical source, of that notable crisis of Athenian history. It is also most agreeably and effectively narrated. But in regard to the special purpose for which the narrative professes to be introduced, it is quite out of place. The real motive for its introduction was evidently, not so much to illustrate this part of the main text, as to give expression to some peculiar feeling connected with the transactions described, or the leading persons engaged; and to enforce that particular version of those transactions, and that particular view of the character and motives of those persons, which Thucydides here and elsewhere so keenly advocates. As the natural course of his subject offered no opening for his purpose, he has made one for himself, at the expense of a serious flaw in the consistency both of his text and his argument. The subject had already been noticed in his preliminary chapter, and in terms plainly indicating a sensitiveness in regard to it. It has in fact supplied material for two episodes; the shorter passage of the "Archæologia"¹ being but an abridgement of the more detailed account in book sixth.

¹ I. 20. Its entire treatment would, it is evident, have been better disposed of at once in the former place, and such may probably have been the Historian's first intention. But the space it would there have occupied may have appeared an undue extension of that already copious series of digressive commentaries; and he has reserved it for the present, not certainly more apposite, occasion.

In noticing the charge against Alcibiades, of being concerned in the mutilation of the Hermæ, Thucydides accounts in the following terms for the intense excitement which prevailed in Athens on that occasion:

“For the Athenians, knowing by tradition the harshness which had marked the tyranny of Pisistratus and his sons towards its close, and also that its abolition was not the act of the people, or of Harmodius, but of the Lacedæmonians, had been ever since, on occasions of this kind, peculiarly open to suspicion and alarm.” Then follows, in closer illustration of the cause of this feeling, the episode in question, narrating the transactions preceding the extinction of the Pisistratian dynasty; and in particular, how the murder of Hipparchus by the hand of Harmodius had been committed during the Panathenaic festival, the ceremonies of which had been turned to account by the conspirators in disarming suspicion and effecting their purpose. After following out the results of their act of tyrannicide to the deposition of Hippias, the Historian resumes his previous narrative, by the subjoined application of the case of Harmodius and the Panathenaïca to that of Alcibiades and the Hermæ: “The remembrance of which things having been deeply imprinted at the time, and constantly renewed by tradition in the minds of the Athenians, rendered them keenly alive to any tampering with their sacred ceremonial, and rigorous in calling to account those suspected of such practices, which were inseparably associated in their thoughts with plots to establish oligarchal or tyrannical government.”¹

¹ VI. 60.

There can hardly be imagined a less conclusive line of argument than that embodied in these passages. In the first place, what has the circumstance, so pointedly urged, that "the Athenians knew their country not to have been liberated by their own efforts, or by those of Harmodius, but by Lacedæmonian intervention," to do with the matter? The statement appears also at variance with other parts of the author's text; where he seems to impress on his readers, and justly, that the popular Athenian public, whatever more critical inquirers might believe, entertained a conviction that they were mainly indebted to Harmodius and Aristogiton for the recovery of their liberties.

But, allowing this to pass, what analogy is there between the case of the tyrannicides and that of Alcibiades; between the jealousy felt by the Athenians on account of a breach of religious ceremonial committed by the two patriots in the cause of national liberty, and the jealousy inspired by the intrigues of Alcibiades in the cause of despotism? How can it with any propriety be said, that the act which caused the tyrannicides to be idolised by the democracy as the champions of popular rights, had caused the same democracy ever since to view the measures taken for the success of that act as only available for the purpose of destroying those rights? The Historian's reasoning, if disembarrassed of its historical illustrations, and reduced to its simplest syllogistic form, amounts to this: "Harmodius took the opportunity of a religious ceremony to assert (as vulgarly believed,) the liberties of Athens against her tyrants; therefore the Athenians have ever since looked upon all tampering with religious ceremonial as evidence of plots to

“establish tyranny.” It is difficult to comprehend how so acute a writer should have been blind to what must strike every intelligent reader as a palpable inconsistency.

The same disposition to enlarge on matters of special interest to himself, seems also to betray itself in portions of what is strictly speaking his main narrative, but which, being excrescences on its just dimensions, assume in so far an episodical character. His Thracian predilections appear in the bestowal, in frequent instances, on the transactions of that remote corner of the theatre of war, an amount of space in his text out of proportion, either to their connexion with his principal subject, or to any interest which they possess. Such are his accounts of the campaigns, of Sitalces against the Macedonians¹, and of Brasidas against the Thracian potentate Arrhibæus.² A like profuseness of detail is bestowed on the reduction by Brasidas, and afterwards by Cleon, of Toronë, Lecythus, and other petty Athenian dependencies.³ These enterprises, while offering few if any features not common to similar assaults, surprises, or surrenders, are described with a minuteness, equal to any bestowed on the most exciting parallel incidents of the Plataean, Pylian, or Syracusan sieges. Other motives beside mere local interest may here have operated. The capture of these towns took place

Thracian
campaigns
of Sitalces
and
Brasidas.

¹ II. 95. sqq.

² IV. 124. His compendium of Thracian geography and statistics in the former digression, for to such in fact amounts his elaborate description of the Odrysian king's territory and resources, the more it proves his own intimate knowledge of those regions and personal interest in their affairs, the less appropriate the place which it occupies in his text.

³ IV. 100. sqq., v. 2. sq.

shortly after that of Amphipolis, the loss of which city was the immediate cause of the Historian's disgrace. Their conqueror was the same Brasidas by whom he had himself been out-generaled, and whose success is here represented as due, as much to the supineness of the Athenian commanders as to their adversary's skill. It was natural that Thucydides, smarting under the punishment for what he may have considered a venial offence, should have been anxious to prove that the Athenian interests in the district had not greatly profited by his dismissal, or the zeal of his successors in office.

The
"Archæo-
logia" of
Thucy-
dides.

4. Another portion of his work which demands notice in this place, is the introductory dissertation on the early state of Greece, called by the antients his "Archæologia." While this whole disquisition is in some sense a digression from the main object of the History, several of its parts also stand to its own integral substance much in the relation of episode to principal subject. It displays throughout extensive research and acute criticism; and comprises in a small space many valuable facts and speculations. But the argument to which they are subservient is ill-arranged, and in many points illogical. The over-subtlety of the author's genius, and his desire to magnify the importance of his own undertaking, have tempted him not only to cumber his text with irrelevant or unsound reasoning, but to sully his usual dignity of historical style by controversial acrimony.

The ostensible purpose of the "Archæologia" is to show the superiority of the Peloponnesian war, in grandeur and importance, to all former enterprises of the Greek nation; and hence the superiority of his own subject to those treated by all former histo-

rians. In support of this position he dwells on the great power and resources of Greece at the outbreak of the war, in comparison with what she could have possessed at any earlier time, as both the cause and the evidence of the unparalleled magnitude of that national movement. He remarks however that, "owing to the obscurity in which *the immediately preceding* events of her history, as well as those of remoter ages, were involved, it was not possible, on other than mere speculative grounds, to form a clear judgement regarding them." This passage bears closely on the question treated in a former chapter, as to the relation between Thucydides and Herodotus. Either we must assume Thucydides to have been ignorant of the work of his predecessor, or that, if he knew it, he rejected its claims to any distinction above the common stock of half-mythical chronicles, for which in the sequel of the passage he expresses so great a contempt. Satisfactory reasons have already been given for preferring the latter explanation. Nor can anything be more uncritical or untrue, than the latitude of terms in which¹, not only the great Persian war, but the whole train of events between that war and his own time, the whole career of Cimon with the greater part of that of Pericles, are indiscriminately consigned to the same mythical darkness which envelopes the legends of Thebes and Troy. This sweeping stigma, which admits of no qualified explanation, being repeated in equally emphatic terms in several places, is not only unreasonable in itself, but at variance with the subsequent tenor of the Historian's text, where transactions of the periods here described as dark beyond

¹ I. 1. 20.

the possibility of elucidation, are everywhere mentioned as facts of universal notoriety.¹

Taking the case however as Thucydides here shapes it, we are led to expect that, in following out his argument, he would in the first instance have shown, by aid of the imperfect data to which he refers, wherein consisted the great superiority of the Peloponnesian war, in its adaptation to historical treatment, over the Persian war, against which his depreciatory remarks are chiefly directed. But, instead of this, he transports us, by a leap over eight or ten centuries², to the infancy of the Greek race, and enters on an elaborate proof that, "before the Trojan war," barbarism and poverty of resources must have incapacitated the nation from any combined enterprise. After sketching off with good effect the characteristics of this primeval state of society, he dwells on the obstacles interposed by the nature of the country and its population, to the first advances in civilised life. He then passes in review the stages of their subsequent progress; their transition in name and character from Pelasgian to Hellene, on which his commentaries are sound and critical; the suppression of piracy in the Ægæan by Minos, and the substitution of industrial pursuits for the predatory and migratory habits that had hitherto prevailed. With these general remarks are interspersed notices of early changes in dress, and other minor points of social economy; notices which have been censured, not perhaps undeservedly, by antient critics, as beneath the dignity of historical style.³

¹ See above p. 25. sq., and compare Thucyd. i. 97.

² i. 2. sqq.

³ i. 6. : conf. Dionys. Hal. De Thuc. Jud. 19.

His application of these commentaries to his main argument, the want in early Greece of good subjects for historical composition, is limited to the siege of Troy. The magnitude of the Trojan war as a common national effort he does not dispute; but in a subtle disquisition endeavours to show, how greatly it was surpassed by the Peloponnesian war. His logic however is here little compatible with the faith which he places in Homer's account of the former enterprise. If we admit, with Thucydides¹, that, in round numbers, 1200 ships conveyed a force of 100,000 fighting men, collected from every part of Greece, to the coast of Asia Minor; that the armament maintained a position on that coast, and carried on during ten years, with ultimate success, an exterminating war against a little less powerful confederacy of Western Asia; it may confidently be asserted, that the ten years' Trojan war was a greater common effort of the united Greek nation, than the twenty-seven years' hostilities among the several States of that nation, comprised under the general title of Peloponnesian war. For there is another obvious fallacy pervading this whole argument of Thucydides. He has staked his case throughout very distinctly, not on the simple magnitude of each undertaking selected for comparison, but on its being a combined or common undertaking of the Hellenic tribes. But the Peloponnesian war was in no proper sense of the phrase a combined national undertaking. It was all along the very reverse; a civil war among the Greek states themselves, animated by the fiercest spirit of division and contention against each other.

¹ See p. 107. sq. supra.

Having thus disposed of the barbarous period of Grecian history, and its standard martial enterprise, he resumes in a more critical tone, his general survey of the progress of social life, settled habits, and regular government, in the interval between the return of the Greeks from Troy and his own times.¹ He then at length touches on the great Persian war of Xerxes, slightly however, and without any notice of its claims to rival, as a common national enterprise, his own selected subject, which, as already remarked, can in no sense be properly so characterised.

The Historian's episodes are all, except the longer one on Hipparchus, comprised in the first three books of his work. The exception in the case of "the Hipparchus" may best be explained, by the difficulty of finding an appropriate place for its insertion; and but for its length, it might also probably have been connected in full, as it has been in part, with the opening stage of the narrative.² It may hence be conjectured that the Historian, in his original design, had contemplated imparting greater variety to his text, by interspersing a larger amount of such illustrative matter. But as he advanced in the full stream of his narrative, the increasing number and more exciting character of the events which his proper subject forced on his attention, may have checked any

¹ It is remarkable that Thucydides, in this review of the leading vicissitudes of early Greek history, makes not the least allusion to the long and virulent wars between the Spartan and Messenian sections of the Dorian race in Peloponnesus, or to the conquest of the Messenian territory by Sparta. Yet this conquest has been considered, and justly, by all later authorities, as the most important event of the period between the Dorian settlement and the Persian war; and the one which first secured the ascendancy of Lacedæmon in the affairs of Greece.

² See note to p. 130.

further inclination to wander beyond its immediate limits.

5. Attention has already been drawn¹ to the advantage which, in their common art of narrative composition, the poet possesses over the prose historian. The former can not only create his own heroes, but can freely give prominence to every kind of position or circumstance tending to add finish to their portraits. With the historian the case is different. His first duty is a strict adherence to truth. He can neither, without sinning against the fundamental law of his office, invent characters, nor occasions for their display; neither attribute to them actions which they never performed, nor words which they never spoke. The practice of Herodotus is here, as in some other respects, a mixture of the poetical and the historical. There can be no doubt in the mind of any critical reader, that he has both introduced imaginary characters, and ascribed to his real heroes actions which they never performed. He may however be acquitted of that wilful fiction which is the privilege of the poet, to this extent, that he probably himself believed in the reality of all the persons or events described in the strictly historical part of his narrative. But he has certainly supplied his heroes largely with words which he well knew were never spoken, unless in so far as placed by himself in their mouths. Thucydides here follows a middle course between Herodotus and the modern critical historian. His characters all belong to real life; and in no case is there ground to suspect that he has attributed to them actions which

Delinea-
tion of
character.

¹ Vol. IV. p. 471.

they never performed. But he has as little scruple as Herodotus, in attributing to them language which they never spoke. This license is exercised by him solely in the mode of rhetorical address. In the more familiar mode of dialogue, in which Herodotus delights, Thucydides never indulges.¹

The personages of greatest note in his main narrative are Pericles, Alcibiades, Nicias, and Cleon, on the Athenian, and Brasidas on the Spartan side. To these may be added, in the episodical part of his work, the Athenian Themistocles, and the Spartan Pausanias. The list comprises men unsurpassed in the greatness or variety of their qualities. There can be no doubt that their characters were all thoroughly understood and appreciated by Thucydides. But he can hardly be said to have turned to full account the materials for ethic portraiture which they supply. It would seem indeed, from the mode in which this indifference to their value is manifested, that a careful delineation of character did not enter into his scheme of a complete historical work. There could hardly be a finer subject for ethic study than Pericles. Even the crudely digested forms which the portrait of the great Athenian statesman presents in the page of his later biographers, enable us to judge how striking might have been its effect, as worked up by the master-hand of Thucydides, with all the aids which, from personal or contemporaneous sources, were so largely at his disposal. He has however been content

Pericles.

¹ The Melian controversy (v. 87. sqq.), with a few words of the same kind of rhetorical altercation between the Spartans and Platæans (ii. 71.), and the brief interchange of question and answer in iii. 113., the only exceptions to the letter of this remark, cannot be considered as exceptions to its spirit.

with sketching out the few more prominent features that forced themselves on his attention. His birth, parentage, and education are unnoticed. The brilliant course of earlier policy at home and abroad, by which he established so paramount an influence over his countrymen, and secured for them an equal influence over their fellow-Hellenes, form the subject of but a few casual remarks. His presence, even on that part of the Historian's scene of action over which he presides, is neither frequent nor prolonged. The only part of his career to which any justice has been done, is where, on the outbreak, and during the first two years of the war, he is engaged in organising his plan of martial operations for the Athenians. The narrative here certainly conveys a vivid impression of the force of his genius, and the power which it exercised over that wayward democracy; first in swaying their wills to his wise but unpalatable measures; afterwards, in restoring their shaken confidence in his policy, when the privations which it entailed were aggravated tenfold by the horrors of pestilence. The Historian's commentary on the extent and value of his influence, and on the fatal results of its removal, is also sound and critical. The more disappointing is his sudden dismissal of this guardian genius of the Republic from the scene of action, at the moment when he had resumed the supreme direction of affairs, with the dry remark¹ "that he survived" (the commencement of the war) "two years and a half." Regarding the last, and if we may trust later authorities, not the least interesting portion of his life, we are thus left without any information whatever. Not

¹ II. 65.

a word of the cause or mode of his death ; of his private and domestic habits ; of his munificent encouragement of art, science, and letters ; of the splendour of his public edifices ; materials for eloquent enlargement, which in a parallel case no historian of the present day would have left unnoticed.

Similar to the case of Pericles, are those of other leading actors in the Historian's drama. The knowledge of them which he himself supplies is limited to the part they act on his own immediate stage. This reserve may be owing partly to their being contemporaneous. He seems to assume that his readers possessed a competent knowledge of characters of so great notoriety as Pericles and Alcibiades. Hence perhaps how it happens that in his episodes on Pausanias and Themistocles, on the latter more especially, men of the past generation and extraneous to his proper subject, he has bestowed a greater fulness of ethic portraiture than on any living personage. The longest and most effective passage of its kind is that in which he sums up the intellectual qualities of Themistocles.¹ Yet even here the description, though precise as far as it goes, is defective ; the moral attributes of the original having been entirely overlooked.

Nicias.

6. Of the other Athenian characters, Nicias, though introduced at once a ready-made statesman and warrior, is perhaps the one whose qualities have been most fully portrayed. This is owing chiefly to the circumstance, that Nicias is the principal actor in the greatest catastrophe of the war ; with which the particulars of his last days and death are so inseparably interwoven, as to render their detailed description essential to the spirit of the narrative.

¹ I. 138. See Vol. IV. p. 496.

Nicias also, while without pretensions to the brilliant qualities of Pericles, offers perhaps, in the conflicting variety of his own, a study as original in itself, and better adapted to the Historian's imperfect mode of delineation. The narrative accordingly here conveys, through its dramatic details, with little or no aid from descriptive commentary, a vivid impression of his primitive Hellenic virtue and pure patriotism; of his sterling honesty of intention, warped at times by spirit of party or natural obstinacy of temper; of his good sense and clear judgement in the visible affairs of life, so fatally counteracted by degrading superstition in regard to the world unseen and invisible. In the disastrous Sicilian campaigns, his valour and skill in the ordinary operations of war contrast painfully with his want of energy, foresight, and comprehensive military genius. The confidence reposed in him by his fellow-citizens, even at the moment when rejecting, with characteristic levity, his mild lessons of moderation, is strikingly shown in their having intrusted him with the command of that enterprise, in spite of his declared condemnation of it¹, and having continued him in the command after a succession of errors and reverses, in spite of his urgent request to be relieved, on the well-founded plea of incapacity from disease for the performance of his functions.² During this distressing part of his life, the fluctuations of his mind between hope and despair, resolution and vacillation, anxiety to fulfil his duty and dread of responsibility, are shadowed forth by Thucydides with a truthfulness and feeling, the more effective from the absence of all effort to produce effect.

¹ VI. 24.

² VII. 15, 16.

Alcibiades. As neither the earlier nor the latter days of Alcibiades fall within the range of the Historian's narrative, and as he there appears chiefly in his capacity of intriguer, the interest of his character is proportionally limited. The details of the eighth book suffice however to convey a lively impression of the power which this political Proteus possessed, of accommodating himself to men, times, and circumstances; of becoming a Spartan to the Lacedæmonians, a Persian to the Asiatic satraps, and of deluding and outwitting all in their turn, the better to resume his original position as the Athenian Alcibiades at Athens. We obtain however no insight into the sources of these powers of political fascination. Alcibiades, like Pericles and Nicias, appears at once on the scene in the full maturity of his public character. The only introductory notice vouchsafed, is the enigmatical remark, that he was "a man who "in another State might have been considered young, "but was honoured for his illustrious ancestry."¹ In the brief commentary afterwards bestowed on his defects², the Historian points out, with force and precision, the illustration which his character, in common with that of Pericles, supplies of his own political dogma: that the prosperity of democratic government depends on the voluntary subjection of the popular energies to some master mind³, qualified to unite them on beneficial objects. "Occupying," he remarks, "a high position in the eyes of the "citizens, he displayed his ambitious temperament "in habits of ostentatious and lavish expenditure, "which afterwards proved among the chief causes of

¹ v. 43.² vi. 15.³ II. 65. λόγῳ μὲν δημοκρατία, ἔργῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή.

“ruin of the state of Athens. For the jealousy ex-
 “cited in the minds of the people by his luxurious
 “course of life, and the aspiring tendency of all his
 “thoughts and designs, led them to regard him as a
 “common enemy, whose ultimate aim was to usurp
 “tyrannical power. Hence, overlooking his unri-
 “valled abilities as a public leader, in their indig-
 “nation at his conduct as a private citizen, they
 “preferred placing the management of the war in
 “less competent hands: an error, the fatal results of
 “which became manifest at no distant interval.”

Next to Nicias, the Spartan Brasidas is the hero Brasidas.
 of the Peloponnesian war most fully portrayed by
 Thucydides. Nor is there any one of his characters
 for whom he seems to entertain greater respect, or
 on whose acts he enlarges with more evident satis-
 faction. Brasidas certainly appears in his page a
 very admirable person; combining the normal Spartan
 virtues of patriotism and valour, with the best quali-
 ties of the tactician and diplomatist; judicious and
 comprehensive in his designs, able, energetic, and
 rapid in their execution, and possessing an extraordi-
 nary share of that faculty, more or less common to
 Spartiate officers, of influencing the will and directing
 the action of dependent States to the ends of Lacedæ-
 monian policy. The exercise of this faculty in Bra-
 sidas was the more honourable to himself, as well as
 the more successful, that the confidence he inspired
 was due as much to his humanity and good faith as
 to his talents.

This friendly feeling on the part of Thucydides,
 towards the adversary by whom he had been out-
 manoeuvred at Amphipolis, and to whom he hence
 indirectly owed his exile, has been adduced by some

commentators among the proofs of his rigid impartiality. Others would explain it in a less creditable manner, as a mark of favour to the author of the defeat and death of Cleon, the Historian's supposed political persecutor. There is little plausibility in either conjecture. It was certainly the interest of Thucydides, apart from any personal feeling, to exalt rather than depreciate the military qualities of an opponent, whom he had combated, according to his own account, with at least partial success. On the other hand, the folly and cowardice of Cleon would have been more effectually set forth, could the enemy who beat him have been shown to be a blunderer like himself, rather than an able commander.

Cleon.

The remarks suggested by the Historian's character of Cleon have been partly anticipated in a previous page. It is the only one in his treatment of which he has shown a disposition to enlarge on defects. In other cases he dwells rather on the bright than the dark side of the picture. His best vindication from the charge of having, in this single instance, been actuated by malicious motives to swerve from the truth, is the fact already noticed, that the defects stigmatised are the same, both in kind and degree, which with singular unanimity have been ascribed to Cleon by all other authorities. Another evidence of impartiality is the circumstance, that while those authorities represent the whole career of the Demagogue as one unmitigated course of folly or mischief, Thucydides gives him credit for a conduct in some of his undertakings, not very easy to reconcile with the incapacity displayed in others. The apparent inconsistency implies at least a disposition to award him such merit as he really possessed. In his campaign of

Amphipolis, Cleon certainly figures in a contemptible light, both as a soldier and a general. But his other military operations are not represented as open to censure. Thucydides indeed withholds from him the merit of having made good his "insane promise"¹ to capture the Spartan garrison of Sphacteria. He describes² Demosthenes as having already matured his measures for the success of that enterprise, and as the director in chief of their execution. But there is no hint of Cleon, as the honorary commander in chief on the occasion, having shown any want of capacity or courage. In the early part of his ensuing Thracian campaign his operations are represented not only as successful, but as well planned and vigorously executed. He even on one important occasion outmanœuvred the formidable Brasidas by whom he was afterwards defeated; and, by a curious coincidence, much in the mode in which Thucydides himself had been discomfited not long before by the same able adversary.³

7. The language in which the Historian's characters give dramatic effect to their qualities, is limited, all but exclusively, to set speeches delivered on public occasions. It has already been shown that these passages possess no solid pretensions to be the genuine orations of the persons in whose mouths they are placed; that they are, as the Historian virtually admits, his own compositions, worked up, possibly on some basis of original matter, into the form which appeared to him best adapted to the occasion or the genius of the speaker. Nor can it be denied that such adaptation is perceptible in some cases; that there is for example a dignity in the orations of

Speeches,
as illustra-
tive of
character.

¹ IV. 39.² IV. 29. sqq.³ V. 2.

Pericles which is wanting in those of Cleon, and a gravity and simplicity in those of Nicias which broadly contrast with the self-sufficient pomp of Alcibiades. But while any such individuality of character is chiefly confined in all the Speeches to these general features, all are pervaded by a common mannerism, and seasoned by common peculiarities of thought and expression, reflecting a corresponding community of origin. The same moral and political maxims, the same flowers of sophistical rhetoric, reappear, often in identically the same terms, in the mouths of different persons. When we further observe, that many of these idiomatic passages also recur in the parts of the Historian's text where he speaks in his own person, the inference becomes unavoidable, that they reflect the genius of Thucydides rather than that of the officiating orator. It might perhaps by a stretch be assumed, that some of his favourite rhetorical phrases may have been really common to his fellow-Athenians; to Pericles, Nicias, Alcibiades, and the nameless "Attic envoys." But they could hardly have been equally so to a number of speakers, not only of different characters, but of different tribes and dialects; Spartans, Syracusans, Bœotians, Mytilenæans.¹ His method may be illustrated by the practice of modern painters, accustomed to design their principal female figures after some favourite living model, whose original form and features everywhere reappear, under the several attributes of a Minerva or a Madonna, a Herodias or a Lucretia. No less discernible in all the specimens of oratory which Thucydides has bequeathed, are the fundamental cha-

¹ See Appendix G. No. i.

racteristics of his own eloquence, whether reproduced in the person of an Athenian Pericles, a Spartan Brasidas, or a Syracusan Hermocrates.

While, with these common evidences of non-originality, there may still be observed in some cases, a general harmony between the orator's own character and that of his Speech, in others there is a no less obvious uncongeniality. Several long orations, remarkable for rhetorical casuistry, are placed in the mouths of Spartans, and of Spartans who, as judged by their actions, were distinguished by the blunt simplicity of temper and demeanour proper to their nation. If the addresses, of Brasidas to the Acanthians¹, and of the Spartan envoys to the Athenian council², are to be considered as genuine, either the popular notions of Laconian eloquence must be founded on error, or these particular Spartan orators must have formed their style in the school of some Attic or Sicilian rhetor.

Apart from the supposititious character of these orations, or the intrinsic value of their contents, they are in principle vicious excrescences on the body of a historical work. Even were they genuine, they would, with rare exception perhaps, where spoken by celebrated orators on memorable occasions, appertain properly to the original sources or raw material of history; to be founded on, or quoted, only in so far as consistent with a judicious use of documentary evidence. As mere exercises of the historian's rhetorical art, they become doubly objectionable. An author is as little justified in imposing on his readers an imaginary oration, as an imaginary battle. These strictures may seem to apply

¹ IV. 85.; conf. II. 87.

² IV. 17.

as well to the taste of the public which sanctioned, as to Thucydides who availed himself of, this privilege of Greek historical art.¹ The leaders of the public taste are however responsible for its defects; and Thucydides may here certainly rank as a master rather than a disciple. But even as referred to the more indulgent standard of his times, his Speeches are an abuse of his privilege. They encroach too largely on the narrative text; are too long and laboured, and are condemned as such by the best native critics. That this unfavourable judgment dates from the Historian's own age, appears from the reason assigned by Cratippus, how far correctly matters little to the present point, for the want of Speeches in the eighth book, that the author had himself become aware, that those passages in the previously published parts of the work had proved wearisome to his readers.

Speculative or Didactic element of his work.

History, in its earlier stages little more than a dry detail of facts, comprises, when cultivated as an art, two elements; a purely narrative, and a speculative or didactic element. The first contains the simple record of acts and events; the second examines their relative merits or importance, and draws from the conduct and motives of those engaged, lessons applicable to other times and circumstances. As historical literature advances, the larger, as a general rule, the didactic ingredient becomes; and has at times been carried to an excess, tending to convert history into a mere vehicle for moral or political disquisition. Herodotus indulges but seldom in purely speculative discussion; Thucydides, in that part of his text where he speaks in his

¹ On its origin see Vol. IV. p. 127. sqq.

own person, even less than Herodotus. His few moral or political reflexions are embodied chiefly in the form of summaries of the more striking general characteristics of the times. Such, for example, is his elaborate description of the unwonted virulence with which the strife of faction raged during the Peloponnesian war. In those speculations, common with modern writers, on the eventual possibilities or probabilities of history,—how far any one transaction may have stood in the relation of cause or effect to any other, or what the cause of events might have been, had a different conduct been pursued,—Thucydides rarely indulges. The nearest approach to an example is his commentary on the beneficial influence of Pericles on the destinies of Athens; where the successes achieved by the Athenians, even after his death, are attributed¹ mainly to the energy and resources bequeathed by him, their reverses to their own bad management. A somewhat parallel passage is that already cited, on the mode in which the moral defects of Alcibiades counteracted the influence of his brilliant talents in maintaining the fortunes of the republic.

In one sense it may however be said that the speculative element of history abounds in Thucydides; inasmuch as his Speeches, which occupy nearly a fifth of his entire text, comprise disquisitions not only on the questions immediately under debate, but often on such others as the several orators may think fit to introduce. Considered in this light the Speeches are no doubt instructive documents, affording, on the conduct and motives of political parties, much information essential for the reader to possess, and

¹ II. 65.

on the correctness of which, with rare exception, as full reliance may be placed as if it had been imparted in the Historian's own words. Through this medium it is, that we are made to apprehend the cause of the general leaning of the smaller Greek States towards Sparta, and of their dislike and mistrust of Athens. The unblushing candour with which the Athenian orators everywhere admit their national policy to be founded on the right of the strong to govern, and where expedient, to oppress the weak, however fictitious that admission may be in their own mouths, conveys as faithful an impression of the political principles of the ruling democracy, as could have been derived from the Historian's own definition of them. In the same way we learn, in reality from Thucydides ostensibly from Nicias and Alcibiades, the grounds on which the war party promoted, and the peace party condemned, the Sicilian expedition. But this very fulness and impartiality with which the contending interests are permitted to enforce their views and rights, seems to have been considered by Thucydides as relieving him from any obligation to interpose his own judgement. On no occasion has he, at the close of a debate, hazarded a remark on the merits of either side, or the relative strength or weakness of the arguments used.

Literary
style
of Thucy-
dides in
the nar-
rower
sense.

8. Among the characteristics of the Attic historian, the one which in every age has afforded the favourite theme for criticism is his literary style in the narrower sense; the general tone and structure of his language. Nor has this special tribute of attention been unworthily bestowed; there being undoubtedly no feature of his art of composition, in which the idiosyncrasy of his genius is more vividly reflected.

It is essential to a right judgement of the style of Thucydides, that a distinction be drawn between its historical or narrative, and its rhetorical element. To the latter belong, together with his set speeches, certain other passages among the few where his speculative remarks are delivered in his own person, and where they are also apt to assume a rhetorical tone.

His narrative style is distinguished by great and varied excellence. It is vigorous, lucid, and unaffected, teeming with pith and substance, and combining in just proportions amplitude and conciseness, brings home events and objects in the most distinct and effective manner to the senses. It has been censured by the antient critics as occasionally harsh or rugged ; and doubtless its exuberant fulness of matter and conciseness of expression, may render it less palatable at first to the ordinary reader than the easy excursive simplicity of Herodotus. His syntactic arrangement, a medium, like that of Herodotus, between the sententious brevity of the old logographers and the expansive fluency of the Sicilian rhetors, represents the natural flow of ideas in a clear head, with a tendency at times to the undue prolongation and involution of periods, common to the best of the early Attic prose writers.¹

His
narrative
style.

The narrative style of Thucydides is however superior to that of Herodotus, in adapting itself with greater versatility to the spirit of different subjects. In his accounts for example of vigorously conducted naval and

¹ See for example vi. 64., iv. 73. In some cases the prolixity and confusion are greatly owing to the false punctuation of modern editors.

military enterprises, the Attic historian surpasses his Ionian rival in the graphic power and spirited flow of his language. In no other author do we find the same combination of fluency and compression, of copiousness and clearness of matter with rapidity of manner, which distinguishes many of these passages. Thucydides often dispatches in a few sentences a course of action which might have supplied most other writers with materials for pages. Yet, on pausing to look back on the train of events through which we have been so speedily conducted, we find nothing wanting to complete the picture, and are only left to wonder how it could be so distinctly spread out within so small a space. Where a more circumstantial minuteness is required, as in the complications of diplomatic or political intrigue, the diminution of fluency is compensated by increased precision of statement. Where, on the other hand, the subject possesses some warmer ethic or pathetic interest, as in the episodes of Pausanias and Themistocles, the Athenian pestilence, or the great Syracusan catastrophe, without relaxing his habitual vigour, he indulges in a greater amplitude of descriptive detail. Owing however partly to his characteristic conciseness, partly to the absence of dialogue, those portions of his text rarely attain to the full poetical effect of the parallel descriptions in Herodotus.

Episode of
Themistocles.

As a fair general specimen of his narrative style, we here subjoin his account of the last days and death of Themistocles.¹

“The Lacedæmonians then sent envoys to Athens, accusing Themistocles of complicity with Pausanias in his traitorous in-

¹ I. 135. sqq.

tercourse with the Persian king, the proofs of which their late proceedings against Pausanias had brought to light ; and urging the Athenians to bring Themistocles also to justice. The Athenians, satisfied of his guilt, appointed officers to accompany the Lacedæmonians who readily joined in the pursuit, with orders to arrest and bring him back wherever he might be found. Themistocles at this time, being under the ban of ostracism, was resident at Argos, but in the habit of making excursions in other parts of Peloponnesus. Forewarned of his danger, he fled to Corcyra, of which republic he had been a benefactor. The Corcyreans, pleading alarm lest his presence in their island should give offence to Athens and Lacedæmon, conveyed him to the opposite coast of Epirus. Hard pressed by his pursuers, who followed steadily in his track, he was reduced, as a last extremity, to seek refuge with Admetus, king of the Molossians, a man actuated by no friendly feeling towards him. Admetus happened to be from home ; but his wife, moved by the stranger's supplications, instructed him, taking her infant son in his arms, to seat himself on the hearth, and in that position await the return of her husband. On Admetus coming in soon afterwards, Themistocles revealed himself, and besought him not to allow resentment, on account of a former opposition to his claims on the Athenian government, to influence him against one who was now an exile, and reduced to so defenceless a condition ; that revenge was a generous impulse only among equals in fortune ; and that while their past quarrel involved considerations of mere pecuniary interest not of personal safety, to abandon him now to his pursuers would be equivalent to taking his life. At the close of this address, Admetus raised him from the ground, on which he had remained sitting with the child on his lap, that being the most solemn form of supplication ; nor, on the arrival of the Lacedæmonians and Athenians, could he be induced, by their most earnest solicitations, to deliver him up. He then, Themistocles having expressed a wish to proceed to the Persian court, sent him across the Thracian continent to the Macedonian port of Pydna ; whence, embarking in a merchant vessel bound for Ionia, he was driven by a storm on the naval station of the Athenians, then engaged in the siege of Naxos. Having been hitherto unknown to all on board, he now informed the master of the vessel who he was, and what the cause of his flight ; and threatened, unless effectual measures were taken for his safety by preventing any one

from leaving the ship so long as she lay at Naxos, to denounce him as having been bribed with money to favour his escape. He promised at the same time, that if his instructions were obeyed, the service rendered should be held in grateful remembrance. The master complied; and after riding at anchor a day and a night aloof from the Athenian fleet, they continued their course to Ephesus. This man was afterwards handsomely rewarded by Themistocles, on his receiving from Athens and Argos the property intrusted to friends in those cities.

“Proceeding into upper Asia, in company with a Persian of the lower provinces, he addressed a letter to Artaxerxes, who had lately succeeded his father Xerxes on the throne, in the following terms: ‘I, who now approach you, am the same Themistocles who, when under the necessity of resisting your father’s invasion of my country, among all the Greeks inflicted the greatest evils on your family; and who afterwards conferred on it no less signal benefits, when, fortune having turned in my favour, I aided in delivering Xerxes from danger.’ (Alluding to his conduct at Salamis, and in regard to the bridge over the Hellespont, the preservation of which he had falsely represented as owing to his interference.) ‘I now therefore, driven from my own country on account of my friendly feeling towards you, appeal to your good offices in return, with a promise of still greater services than those formerly rendered. It is however my wish that a year’s delay should elapse, before I make you acquainted with my schemes for the future.’ The king, it is said, greatly wondered at this proposal, but readily granted his request. During the year of interval, Themistocles occupied himself in acquiring as complete a knowledge as possible of the Persian tongue, and of the institutions and habits of the country. On its expiry, he presented himself to the king, with whom he obtained a favour and established an influence, such as no Greek had hitherto enjoyed; partly on account of his former services, and in the hope which he held out of effecting the future conquest of Greece, but chiefly from the admiration of Artaxerxes for his talents, of which he had given so many proofs. For Themistocles was distinguished above all other men, by the vigorous exercise of a naturally vigorous understanding; by the faculty of deciding on the spur of the moment, and with the least aid from previous knowledge or present reflexion, on the course to be taken in any pressing emergency, and of turning the

experience of the past to account in prognosticating or providing for the future. To sum up his character in a few words, he may be pronounced the man of his age most remarkable for the extent and variety of his intellectual powers ; for fertility in expedients ; for rapidity and sagacity in choosing the wisest measures, and energy and success in carrying them into effect. His life was brought to a close by disease ; or, as some reported, he died a voluntary death by poison, despairing of being able to make good his promise to the king. His monument may be seen in the marketplace of Magnesia in Asia Minor, the government of which city the king had conferred on him. . . . His bones are said to have been brought home by his friends, and buried secretly in his native soil, his right of sepulture in which had been forfeited by his treason."

The less favourable points in the Historian's narrative composition, being connected with anomalies of taste more broadly exemplified in his Rhetorical style, will be reserved for consideration under that head of our present subject, to which we now direct attention.

His
rhetorical
style :

9. The principal defects in the genius of Thucydides are an oversubtlety of the Intellectual faculty, and a deficiency in the faculty of Taste ; or at least in that more delicate ingredient of the latter, which acts as a safeguard against popular mannerism and affectation in literature or art. These defects are chiefly observable in the parts of his work here designated by the term rhetorical, especially in the speeches ; also at times in his own illustrative commentaries. The passages in which they prevail may be said, with nearly as much literal as figurative propriety, to reflect the dark side of his art of composition, as contrasted with the light and spirit of his narrative style. Many of those, on the working up of which he has evidently bestowed the greatest pains, are

its defects.

so laboured, sophistical and obscure, that it may be doubted whether any reader can honestly say, that he has read them with feelings of satisfaction. Some we can hardly be said to read at all, in the familiar sense of the term. We study, decipher, interpret them. But continuous fluent perusal is out of the question. Here again the contrast with Herodotus naturally offers itself. The perusal of his work has been compared to a journey along a good road, through a pleasant country, with scarcely a jolt to disturb the ease of the traveller, or an object to offend his eye. The study of Thucydides may be likened to the progress of a sportsman through a picturesque region, consisting partly of open plain, over which he gallops swiftly and joyously, partly of tracts of dense forest, deep morass, or rugged ravine, to be traversed at best with difficulty, at times requiring to be avoided altogether by a deviation from the direct course. Some of the passages illustrated by these figures are either unintelligible, or intelligible in so many ways, as to preclude any general agreement as to their import. In some the meaning is apparent, the construction an enigma; in others the construction is clear, but the sense a mystery to any common understanding.¹

The more defective peculiarities, in sentiment or language, from which the Historian's rhetorical style derives its tone, are: a studied antithetical arrangement of opinions and arguments²; the unseasonable inter-

¹ Of the judgement of the antient critics regarding these peculiarities of Thucydidean style, see Dionys. Hal. Jud. de Thuc. 24. 29.; De Thuc. idiom. 2.; Cicero, Orator, 9.; Brutus, 7. 83.; Hermogen. De formis Orat. p. 400. sqq. ed. Porti; and the curious metrical scholion of Tzetzes, appended to Bekker's stereotype edition: Berolin. 1846.

² Appendix G. No. ii.

spersion, or undue accumulation, of abstract and at times farfetched maxims¹; subtle definitions often of the most obvious things; wire-drawn distinctions between the most palpably different things; and elaborate demonstrations of propositions which no reasonable man would ever think of disputing.² These subtleties of statement or reasoning are still further subtilised by parallel refinements of grammatical structure, either peculiar to Thucydides, or so largely exemplified in his text as to assume in his case the character of idiomatic phraseology. Such are the substitution of neuter verbs, participles, adjectives, pronouns, often of complex syntactical combinations, for single substantive nouns³; of definitions for simple predicates⁴; of metaphysical for physical agencies; of attributes for the persons by whom they are exercised.⁵ The tendency of these expedients is to produce epigrammatic point, by quaint parabolic turns of expression, and generally, by extreme conciseness, or, as the old grammarians define it, by compressing the greatest quantity of sense into the smallest number of words. Some of the condensed categories may be compared, in the art of literary composition, to short hand in that of writing. As in the one case a number of words are contracted into a few ciphers or flourishes, in the other a number of statements are indicated rather than expressed, by a few enigmatical sentences. These artifices of structure are combined with kindred artifices of sound; the antithetical response or jingle in the sense being brought home with a corresponding jingle

¹ Appendix G. No. iii.

² Appendix G. No. v.

³ Appendix G. No. vii.

⁴ Appendix G. No. iv.

⁵ Appendix G. No. vi.

to the ear, by the expedients technically termed by the antients, *Parisosis*, *Paromœosis*, *Homœoptosis*, &c. The effect of these figures, which ought to be, with rare if any exception, the exclusive privilege of poetry, is, partly to secure a certain uniformity of compass or cadence, similar to metre in blank verse, to the sentences composing each pair of antithetical categories¹; partly to produce the reiterations of sound known as alliteration or rhyme in modern metrical composition.²

These reiterations however are not confined to sound. They extend also to the substance of the text; certain distinctions or definitions, which have obtained a special hold on this morbid corner of the Historian's intellect, being reproduced in different parts of his work with a frequency which constitutes them a species of rhetorical commonplace³, analogous to the epic commonplace of the Homeric poems. There is however this difference in the method of the two authors, that while with Homer such conventional forms are used for the purpose of illustrating individual character, or peculiar modes of thought and feeling, and are hence restricted to particular heroes or occasions, with Thucydides they recur on all sorts of occasions, in the mouths of all sorts of men, and are accumulated at times to a vicious excess, which it is surprising could ever have been sanctioned or tolerated by so critical a genius as Thucydides.

This broad difference between his narrative and his rhetorical style, must reflect a corresponding ano-

¹ Appendix G. No. viii.

² Appendix G. No. ix.

³ Appendix G. No. x.

maly in his own genius. The transition from the ease and freedom of the one style to the studied artifice of the other, is indeed often so marked, that had specimens of each been preserved as miscellaneous fragments of classical Attic prose, instead of authenticated parts of a continuous text, it would have been difficult to believe them the production of the same author. The anomaly is explained by the influence to which the Historian's genius was exposed from the genius of his age. Thucydides flourished in the very acme of that period of his native literature, in which the faults exemplified in his pages chiefly prevailed; when, in the early progress of intellectual culture, subtlety of doctrine and sentiment was accompanied by rhetorical artifice of style.¹ While he was thus peculiarly exposed to these sophistical influences, the peculiarity of his own genius rendered him the more susceptible of their power. But, although prose composition among the Greeks was, in all its branches, and at every period, seasoned to a greater extent than now with the forms of public oratory, rhetorical style in the proper sense was, in the time of Thucydides, as now, restricted, as a general rule, to rhetorical subjects. To these subjects accordingly, to his set speeches, with a few other kindred portions of his text, it has, with rare exception, been confined. In the purely narrative parts of his work he has followed the dictates of his own sense of propriety, uncontrolled in any serious degree by other influences. The excellence therefore of his composition, the graphic precision of his narrative, his spirited descriptions, and penetrating judgements

¹ See Vol. IV. p. 121.

on men and things, are the fruit of his own better genius. His rhetorical mannerism reflects the vicious taste of his age, working on his own natural turn for nice distinctions and logical refinements.

Its merits. In dwelling however on the defects of his rhetorical style, as forming in truth the most striking feature of his work, we must not overlook the merits by which those defects are counterbalanced, and to an exaggeration of which they may be traced. Laboured and artificial as are his speeches, they are not all equally so, nor is there in all the same disproportion between the sophistical and the sound argumentative ingredients. With much that is far-fetched and out of place, they contain also much sound, acute, and powerful reasoning ; many valuable lessons of moral and political wisdom, many just and original maxims, and penetrating views of human nature. These, if interspersed in reasonable quantity and in less artificial forms, would have served but to enliven and adorn the pages which they now too often obscure or disfigure.

His relation to Gorgias and Antiphon.

10. The antients describe this mannerism as borrowed in part from the Sicilian school of sophistical eloquence, especially from Gorgias, its most celebrated master¹; and even the scanty remains of that rhetor's oratory supply evidence of close correspondence with Thucydides, both in their general tone of subtlety, and in particular figures of speech.² The Historian's discipleship appears however to have been confined to the argumentative, as distinct from the decorative element of Gorgian style. Of that florid diction, those elaborately rounded periods, that high-flown imagery, and other meretricious graces by which

¹ See above, p. 49.

² Appendix G. No. xi.

the Sicilian school of rhetoric was distinguished, no trace is observable in Thucydides. Nor must it here be overlooked, that so many of the Historian's favourite forms of rhetorical expression are common to his countryman and elder contemporary Antiphon¹, the earliest Attic prose author of whose works any portion has survived, founder of the proper Athenian school of rhetoric, and the master under whom Thucydides is himself reported to have studied.² It is probable therefore that Antiphon also had partially formed his taste on that of Gorgias, the novelty and brilliancy of whose eloquence, from the epoch of his first appearance at Athens, led to its adoption as a standard by her popular orators.

The dialect of Thucydides, also common to Antiphon, is the earliest form assumed by their native Attic in its adaptation to prose literature, after its final separation from the Ionic, with which it was once identical, and continued to be nearly connected down to the time of Solon. The circumstances under which the separation took place have been examined in other parts of this work.³ The dialect so formed is commonly called by grammarians the old Attic, as distinguished from the more refined classical standard of Atticism, established in the next generation by Isocrates, Plato, and their disciples. The distinction scarcely suffices to constitute a specific difference.⁴ It consists, in regard to what can properly be called dialectical usage, in little more than a few unimportant nicetes of pronunciation and orthography, of which critical editors, antient and modern, make so little

¹ Appendix G. No. xi.

² See above, p. 8.

³ Vol. IV. p. 117. sqq.

⁴ Marcellin. in Vit. 52. : conf. Poppo, pt. i. Prolegom. vol. i. p. 207.

account, that the alleged peculiarities of each period constantly alternate in the manuscripts and editions. The properties in which the language of Thucydides has been supposed to differ from the later Attic, are not so much peculiarities of dialect, as of his own usage, resorted to for the sake of imparting zest and pungency to his style, and appertain in great part to that rhetorical mannerism examined in the previous pages.¹

Other
character-
istics of
his oratory

The oratory of Thucydides, even when free from casuistry, is marked by the characteristic subtlety of his intellect. It is an oratory of analytical exposition rather than integral combination. Its effect consists less in giving prominence to the broader features of an argument, than in the close sifting of its details. His attempts at prolonged argumentative periods commonly result but in an accumulation of pithy detached sentences.² Hence that abundance of connecting particles, pointed out by the antient grammarians as a distinguishing feature of his syntactic structure. We look in vain for those torrents of eloquence with which Demosthenes overpowers the convictions of his audience; and examples are rare even of that sustained flow of emphatic language which varies at times the habitual placidity of Xenophon's rhetorical style. His appeals are to the head rather than the heart; to the judgment rather than

¹ Much has been said of the partiality of Thucydides for obsolete, or properly poetical idioms. Dionys. Hal. de Thuc. idiom. § 3.; Marcell. in Vit. § 52. But the examples of such usage which have been or can be fairly substantiated against him, are very few; fewer than may be found in Xenophon, or probably most other standard contemporary prose writers. See Poppo, vol. I. pt. i. p. 252. sqq.

² See for example in the speech of Pericles (II. 62), the argument commencing with *ῥῆσις* *ὁ*, and ending in *καταφρονήματα*.

the sympathies; scarcely ever to the fancy or imagination. But although undue stress may often be laid, or undue space bestowed, on details, the strong points of a case never fail to be well and fully brought out. At times indeed his acute perception of their value leads to their overstatement or needless repetition.¹ The argument, where scope is given for such precision of method, appears at times to resolve itself into the four parts of Proœmium, Exposition, Demonstration, and Peroration, into which Aristotle divides a perfect rhetorical composition.² How far this arrangement may, in Thucydides, indicate a knowledge of such technical rules as already developed in his day, how far it represents merely the natural order in which a skilful reasoner treats his subject, is a question which we have no means of deciding. In other cases other modes of distribution have been preferred according to the orator's sense of the relative importance of the several parts of his argument, and his consequent desire to bring one or other more prominently before his audience.

The antient critics divided rhetorical figures into two classes: I. Figures of speech, where the effect lies in the sound or arrangement of the words; II.

¹ As in the address of the Plataeans (III. 58. sq.) where the reiteration of appeals to Spartan justice, piety, generosity, or humanity, damages the real power and pathos which the passages individually possess.

² In the speech of the Corcyreans (book I.) for example, the first part of § 32., down to ἀρχαίω may be considered as the Proœmium; the remainder of that section, as the Exposition; from § 33. to συμπολιτῶν ἴστω in § 36., as the Argument or Demonstration; and the rest as the Peroration. In the first speech of Pericles (I. 140.), the Proœmium ends with the word αἰτιάσθαι; the Exposition with ἐπιτασσομένη (in § 141.); the Argument with διανοίας (in § 144.); the rest being the Peroration. Similar resting-points might be pointed out in other speeches.

Figures of thought, where the effect is in the sense or meaning. The precise limit between the two classes is not very easy to define; but the figures employed by Thucydides may be described as belonging in part to each class. In his case however the second class requires a further subdivision, into Intellectual and Imaginative figures. His figures of thought are exclusively of the intellectual order. Those of the imaginative order are, where the orator, under the influence, real or assumed, of strong mental emotion, anger, contempt, surprise, incredulity, varies or interrupts the equable tone of his discourse, for the purpose of bringing those emotions more forcibly home to his audience, by dramatic appeals, direct or indirect, to their sympathies. Such, for example, are the triumphant or taunting Interrogatory (*Erotema*), addressed to the adversary, the court, or the audience; the sudden breaking off and dismissal of a course of argument or statement (*Aposiopesis*), as if the point were too self-evident to require proof, or the subject too much for the orator's feelings, or beyond his powers of expression; the *Simulatio*, or Affectation of impartiality, of a fear of overstating his own case, or undervaluing that of the opponent. These, and other similar devices, ethic or pathetic, for influencing an audience, so familiar in the later schools of rhetoric, are as foreign to the practice as to the genius of Thucydides.

Funeral
oration of
Pericles.

11. In illustration of these remarks on the Historian's rhetorical style, it may be desirable to submit to a closer analysis some one of those speeches in which its distinctive attributes are most broadly exemplified. The one which here more immediately presents itself, is the funeral oration pronounced by Pericles over the Athenian warriors slain in the first

year of the war. It is the longest, and to all appearance the most carefully finished in the collection; contains many fine passages, and certainly its full proportion of subtle distinctions, and quaint antithetical turns of sentiment and language. The prevalence of these less agreeable features contrasts the more with the solemnity of the occasion, and with the dignity, tempered by suavity, for which the eloquence of Pericles was commended by Plato and Aristophanes, and to which he owed his surname of "the Olympian."

While no speech in Thucydides can, in its present form, rank as genuine, it is yet probable that some of those attributed to remarkable persons on memorable occasions, may embody the substance of their line of argument, and even some of the more striking passages of the original address. This remark appears to admit of being verified, partly on historical, partly on internal data, in the funeral oration. There can be no doubt that Pericles delivered an address on this occasion. It seems however equally certain that neither this nor any other genuine speech by him was preserved in writing.¹ Yet it would appear that passages of the original had been preserved in the tradition of the Greek public; one being cited by Aristotle²; which, it must also be remarked, does not appear in the version of Thucydides. It was indeed natural that there should be drawn up, from the memories of those present, reports of so memorable an

¹ Quintil. XII. ii. 22.: but conf. III. i. 12., and Cicero, Brut 7., De Orat. II. 22., Orat. 9. There can be little doubt that the specimens of Periclean eloquence here vaguely alluded to by Cicero, are the speeches in Thucydides.

² De Rhetor. I. vii. 34., III. x. 7.

address, more or less accurate in substance, though differing in detail from each other. As one of these the "epitaphian" speech in Thucydides may perhaps be permitted to rank. He would hardly have ventured to publish a purely fictitious report of a harangue by so celebrated an orator, on so remarkable an occasion, which had been heard by thousands of still living persons, and the general tenor of which must have been familiar in the literary circles of Athens. It may be presumed therefore, if the Historian was present, that he has given from his own memory; if he was not present, that he has borrowed from others, the main line of argument, with some of the more striking passages. On the other hand it is equally certain, from the abundance of palpably Thucydidean matter which it contains, and much of which is common to other speeches in his collection, that Thucydides himself is responsible for the form in which the address now appears, and the mechanism with which it has been put together. An attempt to distinguish these different classes of component elements, if not productive of positive results, may not be devoid of interest. Subjoined is the opening passage:

"Many of those who have here formerly addressed you, commend the framer of the law prescribing this oration, as an honour justly due to the memory of citizens slain in battle. To me it would rather appear, that it were better to confer honour on men who have acted nobly, by our acts alone, in the mode which you now witness around this public monument, than to stake the renown of many brave warriors on the imperfect eloquence of a single orator."¹

This declaration he follows up in the sequel by announcing, that while deferring in all reasonable

¹ II. 35.

respects to the received usage, he will endeavour to vary and improve it in accordance with his own view, by discoursing, not so much on the glorious services, already so well appreciated by his audience, of those whose loss they deplored, as on the common source of every virtue which adorned the Attic citizen,—the excellence of the country which gave him birth, and of the institutions in defence of which the heroes, whose ashes were strewed before them, had so nobly died.

The sentiment which gives the tone to this exordium, and supplies in fact the text of the whole oration, is a noble one. To originality it can advance little claim; reducing itself very much to the trite doctrine, that, “Deeds are a better test of human character and conduct than words.” It must however be remembered that maxims which, like that here in question, become, from their very truth and universality of application, stale and trite in the more advanced periods of intellectual culture, were viewed in a different light in its earlier less fastidious stages. There seems therefore no reason to doubt that we have here the original text or theme of the Periclean address, and one hitherto so little hackneyed as to have told with good effect on the audience.

The same indulgence cannot be extended to the subsequent course of argument, where this fundamental key-note, the contrast between Words and Deeds, is harped upon with tasteless tautology, and moulded into every conceivable form of antithetical quibble. Were its repetition limited to this address and others allotted to the same speaker, there might be room for supposing that it really was a favourite figure of Periclean oratory. This explanation how-

ever is precluded by its recurrence, in the same or similar profusion, throughout the Historian's text. It forms in fact the most copious ingredient of what has above been characterised as his rhetorical commonplace; being reproduced in his work, under different modifications about eighty times. This oration alone supplies, inclusive of the introductory paragraph, some eighteen examples¹; and in several places they are accumulated to an excess, which it is scarcely conceivable how Thucydides himself, and altogether incredible that Pericles, could have tolerated.

In a subsequent passage the panegyrist, when enforcing his remark, that "the renown of illustrious men was better secured by their own acts than by other men's oratory," delivers himself of another strongly marked sentiment, with better claims no doubt to originality than that above cited, but with less title to rank as Periclean. "For," he tells us, "the praise bestowed on others is palatable to an audience, in so far only as each man present feels conscious of being himself qualified to perform the deeds commended; where it exceeds that measure, the feelings inspired are those of envy and incredulity."² Even were this maxim true, it is one with which an orator of so fine tact as Pericles would never surely have insulted the ears of his fellow-citizens. When reduced to plain language, it amounts to telling them, that so narrow were their minds and envious their tempers, as to disqualify them for appreciating virtue of the highest order. But the doctrine is as untrue as it is invidious. There may no doubt be minds so morbidly constituted as to be susceptible of

¹ See Appendix G. No. x.

² § 35. in fine.

the imputed influence. But of the mass of mankind it may confidently be said that the reverse holds good ; that while the public admiration for truly great characters, is enhanced by the reflexion that they are placed by their very excellence beyond the reach of envy, few things are more likely to offend a popular assembly, than the bestowal of undue praise on ordinary merit. The orator follows up this curiously conceived compliment to his audience, by a eulogistic commentary on the Athenian constitution and character, as contrasted with the opposite peculiarities of the Spartan commonwealth. This part of the address may, in substance, emanate from Pericles ; being an ingenious, and on the whole just, though partial parallel of the rival representatives of Hellenism. But its form of expression everywhere betrays the defects of the Thucydidean rhetoric, teeming with enigmatical sentences, abstract propositions, and antithetical commonplaces, familiar in other specimens of the Historian's eloquence. The whole is wound up by another fine passage ;

“ Such is the commonwealth, in defence of which, and of their right to its enjoyment, these men fell nobly fighting ; in the belief that they left not one behind, but was equally ready to suffer in the same cause. Hence it is that I have so greatly extended my remarks on our common country ; as well for the purpose of convincing you, that the contest cannot be an equal one between yourselves and others to whom the same blessings are denied, as in order to give greater reality of effect to my panegyric on those whose loss we deplore. For the highest has already been pronounced : that by their virtue, and that of others like them, the national privileges which I have now commended, have been maintained and adorned.”¹

Here again we can imagine the orator to be Peri-

¹ § 41. in fine.

cles. But in the sequel this dignified tone gives place to a series of poor conceits, ensconced in a scarce penetrable mystification of terms ; where the chief happiness of an Athenian citizen, instead of being centred, as we were just before told, in his love and pride of country, is suddenly found to consist in the possession of riches :

“ For neither was the rich man among them withheld from facing danger by reflecting on the pleasures of his wealth, nor the poor man by the hope of becoming rich if he survived. But esteeming revenge on their enemies an object still more desirable than these, they willingly, in so noble a cause, risked their lives, both to secure that revenge, and in the future prospect of those enjoyments ; committing to hope the unseen chance of success, but trusting to themselves for the execution of the work which they saw before them ; and for its sake preferring rather to combat and suffer, than to yield and escape, they shunned dishonourable report, while with their bodies they did justice to the work, and in one momentary turn of fortune, passed from this life, in the acme of their glory rather than of their fears.”¹

It is difficult to believe that such tasteless subtleties could have proceeded from the mouth of Pericles. The same strain of antithesis, after being continued through an additional half-page, is wound up by another noble sentiment, marred however, both in perspicuity and dignity, by the parenthetical interpolation, for such we would fain consider it, of the perpetually recurring contrast between words and deeds. This superfluity therefore we shall venture to omit, as non-Periclean, in our version of the passage :

“ For the tomb of illustrious men is the whole earth ; nor is the record of their acts to be sought on the graven monuments of their native soil alone, but in the uninscribed memorials of their fame, spread abroad into distant lands.”²

¹ § 42.

² § 43.

The latter part of the address, consisting chiefly of advice and consolation to the surviving citizens, though not exempt from the pervading casuistry, contains fine images and touching appeals to the feelings of the bereaved parents, wives, and children. In addressing the female members of the assembly, the orator is made the organ of the celebrated rule of Athenian domestic life, "that the best woman is she "of whom the least is said for good or for evil."¹ This maxim has since accordingly been ascribed to Pericles. But the merit, either of invention or promulgation, may with better reason be awarded to Thucydides himself. It is not likely that Pericles would so solemnly inculcate in theory a rule of life which he seems in practice, more than any other Attic citizen, to have systematically violated, and done his best to abrogate.²

12. The most effective of the longer speeches is the address of the Plataean captives to the Spartan war commissioners.³ It has however the fundamental defect, common to most of its fellows, of being diffuse and laboured, especially in a case the merits of which lay within so narrow a compass. The appeals in the peroration to Spartan generosity and humanity, while full of eloquence, forfeit much of their effect by the undignified frequency of their repetition. The reply of the Thebans is also more closely to the point than most of the speeches in the collection. While it makes the most of its miserable case, its casuistry, however misplaced in the mouth of a Bœotian, is the more excusable from the difficulty of finding sound pleas in support of such an indictment.

Other
speeches.

The Pla-
tean cap-
tives.

Their
Theban
accusers.

¹ § 45. in fine.

² See Vol. IV. p. 43.

³ III. 61.

Last
speech of
Nicias.

Of the remaining orations, the first of Pericles and those of Nicias are the most practical and least prolix or sophistical.¹ The last short address of Nicias to his troops², when setting out on their calamitous retreat, is the most faultless specimen of eloquence in the collection, whether the merit be due to Thucydides or to the ostensible speaker. It is not only dignified and appropriate, but contains more genuine pathos than any other passage of the whole work. The orations of Hermogenes and of Alcibiades are also to the purpose and well argued.; those of the Sicilian chief being however too long and laboured. The speech of Cleon on the Mytilenæan massacre³, is perhaps the one of the whole which has most the appearance of studied adaptation to the genius of the orator, in the effrontery with which, under the mask of frank sincerity, he stigmatises the vices and follies to which he habitually panders. With more immediate reference to this speech, as a specimen of pure demagogue eloquence, may be noticed a highly meritorious feature common to the Historian's oratory, its entire freedom from vulgarity; a defect into which authors, who undertake to exhibit in detail the manner of popular speakers, are peculiarly apt to fall.

It is also worthy of remark, that the eccentricity of his rhetorical style diminishes as the narrative advances. It is confined in its greatest excess to the earlier books. In the sixth and seventh, as if his stock of such matter had been gradually exhausting, the speeches become more practical, and in the eighth book cease altogether.

Rhetorical
style in the
narrative

The examples of rhetorical mannerism beyond the limits of the speeches are comparatively rare. This

¹ I. 140., VI. 9. sqq.

² VII. 77.

³ III. 37.

was to be expected from the habitual disinclination of Thucydides to embark, on his own account, in those speculative discussions which he is fond of placing in the mouths of others. It is therefore the more remarkable, that the most exaggerated piece of antithetical subtlety contained in his work, his elaborate exposition of the modes in which party bitterness displayed itself during the Peloponnesian war, has been delivered in his own words. It would be difficult, in a translation, fully to convey either the letter or the spirit of this passage; the subjoined attempt is limited to its commencement.¹

part of the
text.

“The customary sense of words was perverted in their application to deeds; reckless daring was esteemed trusty valour; provident delay, plausible cowardice; prudence, a cloak for timidity; wise caution in everything, good for nothing; maniac fierceness, a manly spirit; conspiracy in present security, a legitimate safeguard against future danger; the merciless partisan, true to the death; the advocate for mercy, of doubtful fidelity; the successful plotter, a wise man; the detector of plots, a still wiser;” . . .

and so on through the greater part of an octavo page.

The defects of the Historian's narrative style, to the merits of which ample justice has already been done, consist chiefly in the occasional interspersions of the same figures of speech which abound in his rhetorical passages. His love of conciseness, a main source of obscurity in the latter, has been turned to valuable account in imparting vigour to his narrative, and only in rare instances carried to excess. Examples also occur of the opposite faults; the undue prolongation of periods, accompanied by involution or paren-

¹ III. 82.

Descriptions
of
battles.

thetic complication; defects common to other great Attic writers, and the origin of which, with such apology as they admit, has occupied attention in a former chapter. In his description of striking events, he is too apt to aim at effect, rather by an accumulation of details, than by the more truly effective mode of bringing out strongly the bolder features. As examples may be noticed his accounts, of the night battle of Epipolæ¹, and of the last great sea-fight in the harbour of Syracuse.² In both these descriptions, the particulars which every intelligent reader would figure to himself as more or less common to all battles fought under like circumstances; the ardour with which both officers and men were animated; the exhortations of the former; the mode of their reception by the troops; the shouts with which the combatants encouraged each other; the tactics of the pilots; the exertions of the mariners and soldiers in the execution of their several duties; the cheers of the victors and the cries of the vanquished, are recapitulated with a scrupulous minuteness, detrimental to the object which it is meant to serve. The excitement among the spectators who witnessed the battle from the Athenian camp is similarly described.³ A certain prominence might with propriety be given to an episode of this nature; but the specification of the modes in which the assembled crowd displayed its

¹ VII. 43. sqq.

² VII. 70. sqq.

³ § 71. As a natural consequence of this greater effort at precision of descriptive effect, these passages show a greater tendency to antithetical jingle of structure and sound than other parts of the narrative text; for example:

πλείσται γὰρ δὴ αὐταὶ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ ἐνανμάχσαν.
οἱ ἐπιβάται ἐπειῶντο, . . . ταῖς ἀλλήλων ναυσὶν ἐπιβαίνειν.
οὗς σαφῶς ἴσασσι προθυμουμένους . . . διαφυγεῖν, τοὺτους αὐτοὶ φεύγοντες
φεύγουσι.

emotions; of the exact position of the groups of which it consisted; of the precise amount that each saw and heard, with the vicissitudes of their feelings and gestures, even to the nervous "bobbing" or "ducking" of their heads or bodies, in sympathetic response to the critical turns of the combat, are overstated to superfluity or triviality.

These passages have been much commended by the old commentators as specimens of the Historian's power of poetical description. But the term poetical can hardly here be interpreted in the sense which it now familiarly bears, as indicating ideal beauty or grandeur of thought or expression; rather in that of "highly coloured," or "elaborately finished." True poetical effect does not consist in exaggerating details; and a wholesome taste derives more gratification from the battles of Marathon, Salamis, and Plataea, as sketched out by Herodotus, than from the overcharged pictures of Epipolæ or Plemmyrium.

There is more propriety in the application of this method to the pestilence at Athens.¹ The Historian's immediate object in this case was to bequeath to posterity an accurate description, physical as well as historical, of that memorable epidemic; and the first sentiment inspired is one of gratitude for the admirable manner in which he has executed his purpose. It could not obviously have been attained at a less cost of circumstantial detail. Here too the aid of poetry, in the better sense, has been successfully called in to heighten the general tone of the picture; in the apostrophe, for example, from the bewildering influence of the disorder on its human victims, to its por-

Of the
plague at
Athens.

¹ II. 47. sqq.

tentous effects even on the birds and beasts of prey, usually the only gainers by such dire calamities. The description of the conduct and feelings of the relatives of those infected is also worked up with much truth and nature.

Conclu-
sion.

In drawing this memoir to a close, one remark yet remains to be added, in which it is believed few practised students of Thucydides will refuse to concur, and which may go far to palliate any apparent harshness of the judgements passed in these pages on his literary style: the longer his work is known and the more it is read, the more it is liked and admired; the less sensible we become of its faults, the more highly we prize its merits. This "improvement on better acquaintance," to use a familiar phrase, is a common if not an infallible test of excellence in literature and art. In poetry and prose, as in painting, music, architecture, the works which command the most durable admiration are seldom those which have produced the most favourable first impression. As the conceptions of genius, especially of eccentric genius, necessarily range at times in an eccentric sphere, it seems but natural that a certain effort should be required, to enable other minds fully to apprehend or appreciate them. The form in which the eccentricity of Thucydides is chiefly displayed, is the contrast between the enigmatical subtlety of thought and expression that pervades one large portion of his text, and the clear common sense and sound judgement which animates the remainder. His rhetorical passages may indeed be said to be composed in a language of his own; a language so different from that of ordinary men, that to ordinary men much appears hard to comprehend, and, even where intelligible, grates at first harshly on

the ear and the understanding. But on a more complete familiarity with the whole idiomatic vocabulary in which his equally idiomatic ideas are embodied, the difficulties at first experienced are gradually smoothed down, and in great part sooner or later vanish altogether. The intrinsic worth of the matter is more thoroughly felt and valued, the harshness of the manner is forgotten or overlooked.

Something no doubt in this change of impression may be attributed to the self-satisfaction we are apt to experience in overcoming, or fancying we have overcome, difficulties; something to the pleasure afforded by the study of rare or curious traits of character; much even to the force of habit, which often renders what is familiar in the end agreeable. The case may be compared to that of acquired tastes in diet; of viands which at first prove nauseous, owing to some strange or pungent flavour, but by continued use become both easy of digestion and grateful to the palate.

CHAP. XI.

XENOPHON: HIS LIFE AND TIMES (435—350 B.C.)

1. HIS BIRTH, PARENTAGE, AND EARLY LIFE. EPOCHS OF HIS BIRTH AND DEATH.—2. ENTERS THE SERVICE OF CYRUS.—3. MARCH FROM SARDIS TO BABYLONIA IN SPRING, 401 B.C. BATTLE OF CUNAXA IN AUTUMN, 401 B.C. DEATH OF CYRUS.—4. POSITION OF THE GREEKS AFTER THE BATTLE. MURDER OF THE FIVE GENERALS.—5. XENOPHON APPOINTED TO COMMAND A DIVISION.—6. TAKES THE LEAD IN CONDUCTING THE RETREAT. MARCH UP THE TIGRIS. CARDUCHIAN MOUNTAINS. CONTINUED HARD FIGHTING. WESTERN ARMENIA. THE ARMY OVERTAKEN BY WINTER.—7. FORDS THE EUPHRATES. ITS SUFFERINGS. CONTINUED HARD FIGHTING. VIEW OF THE SEA. ARRIVAL AT TRAPEZUS IN SPRING, 400 B.C. ATTACK ON THE DRILÆ. CERASUS. THE MOSTNGCIANS. COTTOBA.—8. XENOPHON'S SCHEME OF COLONIAL SETTLEMENT. DISSENSIONS IN THE ARMY. HARMENÆ. THE SUPREME COMMAND CONFERRED ON CHIRISOPHUS.—9. HERACLEA. MUTINY AND DISRUPTION OF THE ARMY. ITS REMUSTER AT CALPE. DISASTERS AT CALPE.—10. BYZANTIUM. TYRANNICAL CONDUCT OF THE SPARTAN AUTHORITIES. SERVICE OF THE GREEKS UNDER SEUTHES IN THRACE.—11. SERVICE UNDER THE SPARTAN HARMOST THIMBRON IN ASIA. SENTENCE OF EXILE PASSED ON XENOPHON. HIS RETURN TO GREECE WITH AGESILAUS. HIS SETTLEMENT AT SCILLUS. RESTORATION TO HIS CIVIC RIGHTS. HIS DOMESTIC RELATIONS. CLOSE OF HIS LIFE.—12. CAUSE OF HIS BANISHMENT. ANTIENT AUTHORITY. MODERN THEORY.—13. BEARINGS OF THE QUESTION ON HIS MORAL CHARACTER. HIS SPARTAN CONNEXIONS. WITH AGESILAUS AT CORONEA.—14. HARSHNESS OF HIS SENTENCE.—15. HIS CHARACTER, LITERARY GENIUS, AND HABITS OF LIFE.—16. HIS PARTIALITY AS A HISTORIAN. HIS DEFECTIVE PATRIOTISM.—17. HIS RELIGIOUS BELIEF. HIS PHILOSOPHY. HIS LITERARY STYLE. HIS WORKS.

1. THE materials for a Life of Xenophon, derived from secondary sources, are, as in the case of his two distinguished predecessors, limited in amount, and of slender authority. The information, on the other hand, which he has transmitted concerning himself is so abundant, as to constitute an ampler fund of authentic biographical data than is extant in the case of any previous or contemporary man of letters. For

this advantage we are indebted to the prominent part acted by him in some of the principal transactions which he records, and hence the greater opportunity for allusion in his narrative to his own concerns. Herodotus is only known to fame as a historian; and Thucydides was indebted for such celebrity as he enjoys in any other character to a single event, which, had it not been recorded by himself, might barely have sufficed to secure for his name its present, not very honourable place in the military fasti of his native republic.

All that we learn from Xenophon himself regarding his birth and original condition in life is, that he was an Athenian. His biographers are further agreed that his father's name was Gryllus, of the Demus of Erchë. This statement is partly confirmed by the better attested fact, that the Historian had a son also named Gryllus¹, the custom of calling children after their grandfathers being common in Athens. Diogenes Laertius, whose Life of Xenophon is our most copious source of subsidiary information², describes him as distinguished for manly beauty. Of the date of his birth no specific notice has been preserved. Stesiclides, a professional chronologer of uncertain age, places his death³ in 360 B.C.; and according to Lucian he attained the age of ninety.⁴ These data would carry his nativity as far back as 450 B.C. It is certain however that he survived the year 360 B.C., from his own allusion to events long subsequent to that date. In the Hellenica⁵ he mentions the death of Alexander, tyrant of Phæræ in

Birth,
parentage,
and early
life.

Epochs of
his birth
and death.

¹ Aristotle, Ephorus, alii, ap. Dion. Laert. in Xenoph. § 48. sqq.; Lucian. Amores, 49.

² § 48.

³ Ap. Diog. § 56.

⁴ Macrob. 21.

⁵ vi. iv. 36.

Thessaly, which happened about 357 B.C.; and his treatise on Athenian finance contains evidence of having been composed not sooner than 355 B.C.¹ He may further be supposed to have survived the lowest of these two dates by a few years, to enable him to complete the works in which they are introduced. Assuming him therefore to have died about 350 B.C., the epoch of his birth would depend on the degree of credit to be attached to Lucian's account of his length of life. Although the letter of that author's statements on such points may not deserve implicit belief, the general harmony between his testimony and that of Xenophon's biographers, with the data supplied by his own writings, can leave no reasonable doubt that he lived to a great age. Allowing him from eighty to ninety years, his birth may have taken place about 435 B.C. This computation is also in unison with the notices of his early life contained in his *Convivium* and *Memorabilia*. In the former of these works, he describes himself as having been present at the banquet given in 420-421 B.C. by Callias son of Hipponicus, in honour of Autolycus, "Victor among the boys" in the Panathenæa of that year. From his account of that festivity, compared with parallel notices in the *Memorabilia*², it may be gathered that Xenophon was about the same

¹ Namely, after the close of the Social war, alluded to in the text of that treatise, iv. 40., v. 12. See Boeckh, *Staatsk. der Ath.* iv. 21.; who however, on grounds not stated, assumes that war to have terminated in Ol. 103. 1, or 356 B.C. Other standard authorities, Clinton, Thirlwall, Grote, adopt the more recent date here preferred. It is further obviously more probable that the treatise should have been published in the year after the Peace, to which, and to its effects, the above-cited passages refer (or 354 B.C.), than in the very year in which the Peace was concluded.

² Appendix H. § 1.

age as the juvenile athlete whose triumph he assisted in celebrating; and Autolycus must at this time have been under sixteen, that being the age at which youths passed from boyhood into puberty. Xenophon, upon this computation, would have been about thirty-five in the year 401 B.C., when, after the death of Cyrus at Cunaxa, and the murder of the principal Greek generals, he describes himself, in several passages of the *Anabasis*, as the youngest of the warriors chosen in their place to conduct the retreat homewards. These passages, it is well known to the reader conversant with this chapter of literary history, have supplied commentators with material for widely different opinions; some maintaining that, consistently with their import, the Historian could not at that time have been much above twenty-five; others arguing, with equal confidence, that he could not have been much under fifty. The intermediate estimate here preferred seems borne out, as well by a fair balance of the arguments urged in favour of each of the two extremes, as by the other chronological data to which attention has above been directed.¹

The only ascertained facts in the first part of Xenophon's life are, his having been from an early period of youth a disciple of Socrates, and his having been present with his master at the Banquet of Calias, if indeed his notices of that festivity are to be considered as strictly historical. The story of his preservation from death by Socrates at the battle of Delium², in 424 B.C., belongs to the mythological element of Attic literary biography. Xenophon is described as having on that occasion served in the

¹ Appendix II. § 2.

² Strabo, ix. p. 403.; Diogen. La. in Socrat. § 22.

Athenian cavalry; as having fallen from his horse during the flight, having been taken by Socrates on his shoulders, and carried about a mile, until they reached a place of safety. By reference to the foregoing adjustment of dates, this battle would have been fought in the Historian's twelfth year, nine years prior to the age at which an Athenian citizen was qualified by law for military service abroad. But apart from this objection, it happens that while, in the dialogues of Plato, the conduct of Socrates in this battle of Delium forms the subject of frequent and detailed allusion by his friends or pupils, the terms of those allusions are not compatible with the popular legend regarding it. Alcibiades and Laches both describe themselves as having accompanied their master in his flight; but neither of them, in his account of what took place, notices the presence of Xenophon, still less his preservation from death by Socrates¹. Alcibiades pointedly mentions having been himself on horseback, while Socrates retreated on foot; and that he rode slowly by his master's side, the better to protect him. Had Socrates had another man on his back all the time, his lively eulogist would hardly have omitted a circumstance calculated to add such pungent zest to his narrative. Nor, apart from this, in itself conclusive objection, is it likely that Plato, by whom these notices of the Delian action are introduced with a view of magnifying the disinterested valour of the Philosopher, would have omitted an episode of the battle better adapted to his purpose than any which he has recorded. In further proof of the fabulousness of this

¹ Plato, *Sympos.* 219—221. (conf. *Plutarch*, *Alcib.* 7.); *Laches*, p. 181.; *Apol. Soc.* p. 28. *alibi*.

adventure, it may be observed that Alcibiades, in one of the passages above quoted¹, describes his own life as having been saved by Socrates at Potidæa. It would be very remarkable if, in each of the two great battles in which he fought, the Philosopher should have had opportunity of performing this exploit in favour of one of his most celebrated disciples.

With the exception therefore of the Historian having been a favourite pupil of Socrates, nothing is authentically known of the first thirty-five years of his life²; prior, that is, to his entering the service of the Persian prince Cyrus. The events which led to this important crisis in his destiny have been described partly by himself³, partly by other, in some respects perhaps more trustworthy authorities.

2. Towards the close of the eventful year 404—403 B.C., the former part of which had witnessed Ly-sander's conquest of Athens, the latter, the restoration of her constitutional government by Thrasybulus, Darius Nothus, king of Persia, died, and was succeeded by his son Artaxerxes Mnemon. Cyrus, the younger brother of the new monarch, had for some years prior to his father's death, held the office of satrap of the north-western provinces of Asia Minor. He was a man of varied talents, popular manners, and boundless ambition, deeply versed in the arts of po-

Enters the
service of
Cyrus.

¹ Sympos. p. 220. : conf. Plutarch, Alcibiad. 7.

² In the notice by Photius (Bibl. cclx. p. 486. Bekk.) of his having been a disciple of "Isocrates," the original reading may probably have been "Socrates." The school of Isocrates could hardly have been opened at Athens until after the banishment of Xenophon. He is also reported in another apocryphal tradition (Philostr. Vit. Soph. i. 12.) to have been a disciple of Prodicus, "during his captivity in Bœotia;" to which captivity no other allusion is extant. By Cicero (De Or. iii. 34.) Xenophon is himself described as the preceptor of Agesilaus.

³ Anabasis, i. i., iii. i. 4. sq.

litical intrigue, and unscrupulous in their employment. During the latter days of his father, he had endeavoured, in conjunction with the queen-mother Parysatis, whose favourite son he was, to induce the old monarch to declare him, in preference to Artaxerxes, successor to the throne, on the plea familiar to Persian political casuists, of his having been born after his father became king, Artaxerxes while Darius was yet a subject. Darius having been found proof against these influences, Cyrus took measures for usurping by force what he had failed to obtain by policy. Shortly after his brother's accession, a charge of treason was brought against him by Tissaphernes, satrap of a neighbouring province. He was summoned to Susa and placed under arrest; but, through the intercession of his mother, was restored to liberty and reinstated in his government. This act of clemency or justice, whichever it may have been, did but inflame the ardour of Cyrus in the prosecution of his ambitious designs; his indignation at what he considered humiliating treatment, superadding thirst of revenge to his other inducements to revolt. During the earlier part of his Asiatic viceroyalty, he had been at pains to ingratiate himself with the Spartan general Lysander¹, in the ulterior view of securing the aid of Lacedæmon in forwarding his schemes; and to the large subsidies with which he supplied her, that State had mainly been indebted for her triumph in the Peloponnesian war. He now accordingly, supported and encouraged by Sparta, occupied himself in enlisting Greek mercenary troops. Among the adventurers whom he had in this way attracted to his court, was one Proxenus, a Bœotian, commandant of about two

¹ Hellenica, I. v. 5. sq., II. i. 11-15.

thousand of these stipendiaries. This man was an old friend of Xenophon, who describes him as a person ambitious, from his boyhood, of distinguishing himself in life, and as having, in order to qualify himself for great performances, paid largely for a course of instruction to the celebrated sophist Gorgias. He had in so far succeeded in his object, that at the age of thirty, or less, he had acquired the favour of a munificent Oriental prince, and the command of an army of choice Hellenic warriors. He is further characterised by Xenophon, in graphic terms, as a man of integrity and honour, but of an easy sensitive disposition, which well fitted him for the management of followers as honest and single-minded as himself, but rendered him less competent to deal properly with such bodies of human beings as that over which he now presided.¹

From this adventurer, then in attendance on Cyrus at Sardis, Xenophon received a letter, inviting him to take service with the prince, a share of whose friendship he engaged to procure him; adding, that "he considered such a patron worth more to him than his native country was ever likely to be." Xenophon imparting the contents of this letter to Socrates², consulted him as to the course he should pursue. Socrates, fearing lest his accepting service with a foreign potentate who had proved a fatal enemy to Athens, might involve him in trouble at home, advised him to apply for counsel to the Pythian oracle. Xenophon proceeded accordingly to Delphi, and inquired of the god, not whether he should embark on the proposed adventure, but to which among the deities he should sacrifice, in order to propitiate

¹ Anab. II. vi. 18.

² Anab. III. i. 5.

its successful issue. Apollo, in reply, gave him the names of the requisite divinities. On reporting the result of his mission to Socrates, the Philosopher blamed him for not having first inquired whether the god approved of the project; but as the question had already been put in the other shape, he sanctioned Xenophon's acting on the answer vouchsafed. He sailed accordingly, after duly inaugurating his voyage by the proper rites. "On reaching Sardis," continues his narrative, "he found Cyrus and Proxenus preparing to set out on a military enterprise, which was described to him as directed against the Pisidians, a refractory vassal tribe, in a distant part of the satrapy. Both Proxenus and Cyrus expressed an anxious desire that he would accompany the army, the prince engaging that he should have full liberty to take his own course after the campaign was over." To this Xenophon consented, deceived by these false statements, for which, he adds, Proxenus was not responsible; for neither he, nor any other of the prince's Hellenic officers, with the exception of the Spartan Clearchus, who stood first in his confidence, had any suspicion that the armament was really directed against Artaxerxes. Nor was it until they reached Cilicia, on the eastern extremity of the peninsula, that this became plain to them all.¹

From the tenor of the above narrative it seems clear that Xenophon was, or believed himself to have been, invited to serve Cyrus in a civil rather than a military capacity. Had he from the first intended to bear arms under the prince, his description of Cyrus and Proxenus urgently requesting his presence on

¹ Anab. iii. i. 4—10.

the proposed campaign, obviously as a step for which he was not prepared, would be unmeaning. It is probable therefore that he had not hitherto acquired reputation or experience as a soldier, beyond what he would naturally attain in the ordinary course of those military duties, from which no Athenian whose manhood extended over some ten or twelve years of the Peloponnesian war, could well have been exempt. And this view is confirmed by the sequel of his narrative, from which it appears, that neither during the six months' march on Babylonia, nor for many weeks after the battle with which it terminated, was he intrusted with any actual command, nor so much as entered on the muster-roll of his Bœotian friend's division. These facts seem to shed a few rays of additional light on the obscurity of his previous life. It may be inferred, from his introductory notice of his friend Proxenus, of that friend's discipleship with Gorgias, and of the importance attached by him to literary culture as a source of distinction in after life, that the original bond of connexion between the two was chiefly of a literary nature. This view is incidentally confirmed by the statement of Ælian¹ (the authenticity of which matters little to the question), that Xenophon, who was some years older than Proxenus, had acted as his preceptor. The Historian's previous life seems, therefore, to have been chiefly devoted to pursuits of a different nature from those in which he was engaged during its ensuing six or seven years. Cyrus would, no doubt, be desirous of securing the services of Greek civil officers, as well as Greek warriors, in his bold scheme of usurpation; and had that scheme been accomplished, Xenophon

¹ Var. Hist. XII. 25.

March
from
Sardis
to Baby-
lonia in
spring of
401 B.C.

might have looked for some high appointment better suited to his tastes and habits.¹

3. In the spring of 401 B.C. Cyrus advanced² eastwards from Sardis by leisurely marches, interrupted by long halts, at points convenient for collecting reinforcements. The army, when fully assembled and mustered on the plain of Babylonia, numbered 12,800 Greek and 100,000 Asiatic troops.³ The Greek contingent was made up of eight independent companies⁴, each under its own leader. But Clearchus, an experienced Spartan general of the Peloponnesian war, was, in all more critical emergencies, deferred to as commander-in-chief. The only serious difficulty experienced by Cyrus in his progress, was the discontent and threatened desertion of the Hellenic troops, on discovering the series of frauds by which he had managed to inveigle them into an enterprise contrary to their inclinations, or to the terms on which they were engaged. The discovery however was not made until it seemed too late with credit or safety to draw back; and, partially reconciled

¹ Here too we seem to have an explanation of the otherwise enigmatical expression of Cyrus in his first interview with his new retainer (III. i. 9.), which has above been freely translated, as intimating that at the close of the campaign "he would be at liberty to follow his own course." The letter of the original is, that Cyrus "would send him away;" which can hardly admit of a literal interpretation; implying nothing more, probably, than that his engagement to follow the camp should not extend beyond the campaign against the Pisidians.

² Anab. I. ii.; see sketch map at the end of the volume.

³ Anab. I. vii. 10. sq.: conf. I. ii. 3—9., I. iv. 3.

⁴ After the desertion of Xenias and Pasion, I. iv. 7. There is however some confusion in the notices of these Greek "Condottieri." Of the ten, inclusive of Xenias and Pasion, mentioned in I. i. and ii., Aristippus never appears; and after the battle of Cunaxa, another, Agias, is suddenly introduced, of whom no mention had been made in the previous narrative. II. v. 31.

to their lot by promises of higher pay, they continued their onward march.¹

It was not until Cyrus, crossing the river Euphrates, had penetrated into the heart of his brother's empire, that he encountered any serious opposition in the field. About ninety miles from Babylon he found Artaxerxes prepared to receive him², with an army rated by Xenophon at nine hundred thousand men, on a plain the name of which the Historian does not mention, but which later authorities call Cunaxa. The Greek force occupied the right of the Cyreian line, with its own right flank resting on the Euphrates, the river forming the key of the position, and securing the army against the risk of being surrounded by the enemy. For so greatly was the force of Cyrus outnumbered, that the centre of the royalist line extended beyond the left wing of the rebels; so that in fact more than one half of the king's army had no hostile force in front of it. The danger was the greater, from the king's superiority in cavalry, usually the best part of a Persian army, and with which Cyrus was ill provided.

Battle of
Cunaxa,
autumn of
401 B.C.

As the moment of onset approached, "Cyrus," says the Historian³, "called out to Clearchus to attack with his Greeks the centre of the enemy, where "Artaxerxes commanded in person." It is difficult to understand how any general of ordinary judgement could, in the position of the two lines as described by Xenophon, have issued such an order. Its execution, if attempted, would have deprived Cyrus

¹ Anab. i. iii., iv. 11—13., III. i. 10.

² I. vii. 12. According to Ctesias (ap. Plutarch, Artax. 13.) he had but 400,000 men.

³ I. viii. 12.

of the only advantage which he possessed to counterbalance the numbers of his opponent, the superior valour and skill of his Greek warriors. Stationed as they were, at the extreme right of the Cyreian army, they would, before they could have reached, or even obtained a clear view of the proposed point of attack, have had to pass by an oblique movement in front of the whole remainder of their own line, and of great part of that of the enemy, for the distance of several miles.¹ The consequence would have been, had the Persian commanders possessed among them sufficient common sense to avail themselves of their opportunity, a scene of confusion, which ought at once to have secured the defeat of the rebel army. It would in fact, to use a modern military phrase, have been "clubbed" from one end to the other. The Greeks, during their oblique movement, would have been exposed in flank, and in marching order, to the attack of the whole imperial force, without any support from their Asiatic comrades, between whom and the enemy they would have placed themselves. Had Clearchus, on the other hand, attempted to execute the manœuvre by passing to the rear of the Cyreian line, its Asiatic portion would have been similarly exposed to the combined assault of the enemy, without a possibility of assistance from the Greeks, on whom they would have been thrown back in tumultuous rout. On the Greeks quitting their position, the right of the Cyreian line would at once have been cut off from the river, and then attacked both in flank and rear by Tissa-

¹ Polybius (xii. 19. 21.) rates the space necessary for drawing up an army of even 45,000 men at much more than two miles. Clearchus would have required, in changing his flank, to pass in front or in rear of an army of 100,000 men.

phernes, the ablest of the Persian officers, who was stationed opposite Clearchus, on the left of the king's force, with its choicest troops, consisting in great part of cavalry. A veteran Spartiate officer could have no scruple in disobeying such instructions, on grounds which the Historian specifies: the distance of the proposed point of attack, the imprudence of deserting the river, and thus exposing the flank of the army to be turned by the enemy. Clearchus accordingly answered drily, that "he would himself take care that all should go well."¹

As Artaxerxes advanced in battle order, Cyrus passed along his own line, watching the movements of the two armies, when Xenophon rode up to him, and inquired if he had any instructions. Cyrus ordered him to inform the Greeks that the rites were propitious. At this moment the prince's attention was arrested by a sound among the Greek troops, and he inquired what it meant. Xenophon answered, that it was the watchword of battle passing through the ranks. Cyrus, with an expression of surprise, asked who gave the word and what it was? "Jupiter the Preserver and Victory," said Xenophon. "I, too, accept it," said the prince; "so let it be;" and rode off to his own position.²

¹ I. viii. 13. See Appendix J.

² I. viii. 14. sqq. There can be little doubt, from the account of this dialogue, from his previous order to Clearchus, and from the subsequent folly and rashness of his conduct, that Cyrus on this occasion, in the excitement of the moment, and in the fury of his vindictive malice against his brother, had lost his head. How could one who had for years been familiar with Greek military service, and for months in command of some twelve thousand Greek troops, be ignorant of, or surprised at, their custom of passing the word before an engagement? even supposing the same custom not to have been common to the Persians, as

On the Greeks charging at a run, the enemy turned and fled. So complete was the rout of this wing of the imperial army, that the attendants of Cyrus, considering the battle won, already saluted him King. The force under the immediate command of Artaxerxes, when attacked by Cyrus at the head of his body-guard, was also broken and put to flight. A moderate exercise of judgement would now have secured his victory, with the throne to which he aspired. But his vindictive rage against his brother deprived him, a few minutes afterwards, with his life, of that long-cherished object of ambition. Observing Artaxerxes, with his chief officers, in the centre of one of the routed masses, he exclaimed, "I see the man," and rushing at him, with a small body of cavaliers, he struck a blow at his breast; but the weapon, owing probably to the blind fury with which it was aimed, inflicted but a trifling hurt. At the same moment he was himself wounded under the eye with a javelin, by one of the king's party. A fierce hand to hand conflict ensued between the brothers and their attendants, ending in the death of Cyrus and eight of his principal officers.¹

Death of
Cyrus.

This catastrophe was the signal for a break up of the slain prince's Asiatic force, his life being its sole bond of union. The only part which kept together was the left wing under the Ionian satrap Ariæus, who, on being informed of the prince's death, quitted

Xenophon elsewhere (Cyp. III. 58.) describes it to have been. It is clear that the prince's mind must have been wandering during his dialogue with the Historian. From the care with which the latter has recorded the, in themselves, trivial details of the dialogue, it may also be inferred, that he was himself struck with something strange in his patron's demeanour.

¹ I. viii. 21. sqq.

the field with the whole body under his command, passed through the Cyreian camp, and halted at the place where the rebel army had been stationed on the previous night. The camp was immediately occupied by the royal troops, with the exception of its Greek extremity, where the detachment left on guard maintained their position, and preserved the baggage of their own army.

In the meanwhile Clearchus had been following up his success in a distant part of the field, in the belief that the victory was everywhere complete. On hearing that the camp was in possession of the king, he remustered his troops in battle order, and proceeded in that direction, still making the Euphrates the resting-point of his present movement, as it had been of his first attack. Artaxerxes, apprised about the same time more fully of the defeat of his left, also reassembled his scattered forces, and advanced to meet the enemy in the same order as in the previous action. But on the Greeks repeating their attack with still greater impetuosity, the Persians fled with still greater precipitancy than on the last encounter, followed by the victors, until sunset and the nature of the ground put a stop to the pursuit, when the Greeks retired to their camp.¹

4. They now began to wonder that nothing had been heard of Cyrus. In the morning they were informed of his death by a message from Ariaëus, who invited them to join him at his own station, if they thought fit to accompany him back to Ionia, whence he came, and whither he proposed returning. Clearchus answered proudly, "that it would ill be-
"come the Greeks, as victors, to desert the field they

Position of
the Greeks
after the
battle.

¹ I. x.

"had won; that he was about to follow up his "success by a renewed attack on the imperial army;" and he made offer to Ariæus of the Persian throne, "the disposal of which, now that Cyrus no longer "lived, appertained to himself as conqueror." This haughty spirit however soon subsided when the real nature of his position became apparent. Ariæus sent back word, that "there were many Persians "more noble than himself, who would never submit "to his rule," and urged the Greeks, if they meant to join in his march homewards, to come over that night, as he intended starting early the next morning. In the course of the day, a Greek in the Persian service brought them a summons from the king to lay down their arms and submit to his mercy. After some consultation, it was replied: that "if the king "proposed to treat with them as friends, they would "be better able to serve him with, than without their "arms; if they were to be treated as enemies, their "arms would be safer in their own than in any other "hands." In the afternoon Clearchus informed his colleagues that the auspices were not favourable to an attack on Artaxerxes, who had now taken up a position beyond the great river Tigris, which they had no means of crossing, but that the rites were propitious to the retreat with Ariæus. The latter alternative was adopted, and they reached his quarters about midnight. On the morrow the two armies commenced their march, but on the evening of the second day they suddenly found themselves in the vicinity of the king's forces.¹ The next morning a herald arrived from Artaxerxes with proposals of friendly accommodation. Clearchus replied that it

¹ II. i. ii. See Appendix K.

was no time to talk of negotiating while his men were starving, and that until supplied with provisions they were resolved on war. The king upon this agreed, that while the terms were arranging they should want for nothing ; and sent guides, who conducted them to a position among villages affording an abundant market. Here they remained nearly a month, during which they were visited from time to time by Tissaphernes, as mediator between them and the king, and who, on the strength of his long connexion with Greece, expressed a friendly interest in their welfare, and a desire to aid their return. Clearchus disclaimed any hostile feeling towards Artaxerxes ; explained how they had been deluded by Cyrus, against their own wishes, to join in his enterprise, and that all they now desired was to march peaceably home, though ready, if opposed, to repel force by force. In the end it was agreed, in a treaty solemnly ratified by all the contracting parties, that the Greeks and Ariæus should continue their journey to Ionia, escorted, for their better security, by Tissaphernes, who was also returning to his satrapy ; that they should enjoy a free market on the route, and in case of refusal, should be entitled to take without payment what they required.¹

During the first fortnight's march, after crossing the river Tigris, circumstances occurred to create distrust of both Tissaphernes and Ariæus. The latter, having received his pardon, was now entirely alienated from his Greek allies, marching and encamping with his fellow-Persians. The former friendly demeanour of Tissaphernes had also given place to coldness and reserve. In this state of things, Clearchus, during a

Murder of
the five
generals.

¹ II. iii.

few days' halt on the river Zabatus, in an interview with the latter, demanded the reason of his altered manner. Tissaphernes denied any change in his friendly feelings; attributing his coldness to reports brought from the Greek camp itself of treacherous designs in that quarter; that he was now satisfied these reports were groundless, and for the more effectual restoration of harmony, he proposed that the chief officers of the Greek army should assemble at his tent on the ensuing day, when he would name the source whence the calumnies proceeded. To this Clearchus agreed, reassured by the satrap's apparent frankness. His fellow-commanders also consented to the meeting, not however without remonstrance from several, who insisted that only a part of those invited should risk attendance. The number thus restricted comprised five generals, Clearchus, Proxenus, Menon, and two others, with twenty officers of secondary rank; and the mission was accompanied by about 200 Greek soldiers on their way to the Persian camp to buy provisions. The five generals were admitted to the presence of Tissaphernes; the other officers remained at the door of his tent. On a certain signal, the five were seized and bound, the twenty were slain; while Persian horsemen were seen from the Greek lines scouring the intermediate plain, and killing every Greek, freeman or slave, on whom they could lay their hands. Intelligence of what had happened was brought soon after to the army by an Arcadian soldier, who, though sorely wounded, had effected his escape to the camp.

The Greeks ran to their arms, expecting an attack on their quarters; when Ariæus, with two other Persians formerly in the service of Cyrus, escorted by

300 horse, rode up, and, as bearers of a message from the king, requested an interview with some person in authority. Upon this, Cleanor and Sophænetus, the two surviving generals, came forward, accompanied by Xenophon, anxious to learn the fate of his friend Proxenus. Ariæus then stated that Clearchus, having been convicted of traitorous designs against Artaxerxes, had suffered death; but that Proxenus and Menon, as the denouncers of his iniquity, were held in high honour by the king, "who," he added, "summons you once more to deliver up your arms, which he considers his rightful property, as they had formerly been that of his slave Cyrus." To this, Xenophon, as his own narrative continues, replied: "If, as you tell us, Clearchus has indeed been convicted of treachery, he has been fitly punished for his crime. But as Proxenus and Menon, who have acted honestly by you, are also our commanders, let them be sent back to us. Being both your friends and ours, they will be of all men best qualified to advise us in our present position." To this the Barbarians made no reply; but after a long discussion among themselves, rode back to their own lines. The captive generals were carried to the quarters of Artaxerxes and put to death.¹

Xenophon's description of the gloomy despondency which overspread the Greek camp, on this calamitous change in their previous hopeful prospects, is the most powerfully pathetic passage of his work. "At a distance of more than 1200 miles from their native land, in the midst of hostile cities and races, their route homewards intersected by impassable rivers, they were deserted and betrayed by those whom they

¹ II. iv. sq.

“ had trusted as confederates in a common cause ;
 “ destitute of provisions or any means of procuring
 “ them, without guides, without a single cavalry sol-
 “ dier, and hence unable when victorious to follow
 “ up their success, or when beaten to protect their
 “ retreat. Their minds oppressed, and their spirits
 “ broken by these sad reflexions, few cared to kindle
 “ fire or to taste food on that fatal night, and many
 “ never appeared at the evening muster. As each
 “ felt inclined they laid them down to rest, but, not
 “ to sleep, distracted with grief, and with longing de-
 “ sire of their country, parents, wives, and children,
 “ whom they never expected to meet again.”¹

Xenophon
 appointed
 to com-
 mand a
 division.

5. It is at this stage of his narrative that Xeno-
 phon first formally introduces himself to his readers²;
 somewhat too formally, having already been several
 times brought on the scene, as a person with whose
 name and character we were supposed to be familiar.
 “ There was,” says he, “ in the camp a certain Xe-
 “ nophon, an Athenian, who had accompanied the
 “ army neither as officer nor private soldier, but had
 “ been invited from his home by Proxenus, with a
 “ promise to procure him the friendship of Cyrus.”
 Then follow the details, already cited, of his engage-
 ment with the Persian prince. This same Xenophon,
 deeply afflicted, but not disheartened, by the present
 dismal crisis in his own destinies and those of 10,000
 of his fellow-Greeks, felt suddenly inspired as the in-
 strument of his and their deliverance. His account
 of the mode in which this sentiment was conceived,
 curiously illustrates the workings of a mind thoroughly
 imbued with that fervid Pagan piety, which forms so
 marked a feature of his character, and the ease with

¹ III. i. 2.

² III. ii. 4. sqq.

which it magnifies the delusions of a disordered imagination, into portentous foreshadowings of coming events or manifestations of divine will. "During
"a momentary slumber that stole over his eyes, as he
"lay perturbed and wakeful in his tent, he saw in a
"dream a storm pass over his paternal mansion, and
"a thunderbolt, falling on the building, envelop it
"in a blaze of light." On awakening, terrorstruck,
"his vision appeared to him in so far auspicious, that
"a great light had visited him from Jupiter in a
"moment of distress. But, in another sense, it filled
"him with alarm. For the God from whom, as he
"judged, the fire proceeded, being Jupiter the King,
"and the flames having spread around in a circle, he
"feared it might portend that he was not destined to
"escape from the King's country, but to be encircled
"within it by insuperable barriers.¹ The real tenor
"of the vision will however," he continues, "be best
"understood from the events which followed." A new
train of wakeful thoughts now passed through his
mind. "How," he exclaims, "can I still lie here!
"The night wanes fast, and with daylight the enemy
"may be upon us. If we fall into his hands, what
"other lot awaits us but an ignominious death! Yet
"no one thinks of defence. All still linger in bed, as
"if a good night's rest were alone required for our
"safety. To what other quarter then shall I look
"for a guide or deliverer? Or what greater ma-
"turity of years or judgement do I myself expect,
"to qualify me for the office?" Upon this he arose,
and first calling together the captains of his deceased

¹ III. i. 11. The punning connexion into which Xenophon has here brought the divine and the mortal kings and circles, throws a curious light on his method of divination.

friend's division, he exhorted them to rouse themselves from the gloomy torpor in which they seemed to be sunk. The worse their position, the more imperative their duty, as men of sense and as brave soldiers, to grapple with its perils and difficulties. "It must be plain to you," said he, "that your enemies, before per-petrating this open act of hostility, had well matured their measures of attack, yet not one on our side seems to be casting a thought on measures of resistance." He endeavoured to raise their drooping spirits by reminding them of their superiority in valour to their treacherous foes, of whose helpless pusillanimity, when opposed by a handful of Hellenic warriors in fair combat, they had already had ample experience. He concluded by calling on those who felt conscious of ability to direct the common efforts, to stand forth, expressing his willingness to serve under any leader who might be preferred; or, "if the choice should fall on himself, he would not be deterred by diffidence of his own age or experience, from devoting to their service those energies, which had hitherto guided him safely through the ills of life."

The response to this appeal was the orator's appointment by acclamation to the command of the division, in the room of his murdered friend. Those present then dispersed through the camp, to invite the cooperation of their fellow-commanders, who also assembled in council before midnight, and were addressed with like effect by Xenophon. At his suggestion four new generals were appointed to the other vacant commands. On the following day a council of war was held. On this occasion Xenophon, expecting an immediate engagement with the Persians,

appeared in his best arms and attire; esteeming, as he somewhat ostentatiously tells us, "this mark of respect justly due to Victory, should she be favourable to their cause; or, should he himself be doomed to perish, it was meet that such honour should attend the death of one who had acted so honourable a part in life."¹ In the renewed discussion he still takes the lead, and all his proposals are adopted. All were now convinced that their only hope lay in their own vigorous action; that it would be folly again to trust doubtful friends, or negotiate with treacherous enemies; and that nothing remained but to fight their way home or perish in the attempt. The order of march is settled on the plan suggested by Xenophon. Chirisophus, the only Lacedæmonian among the new generals, as successor to Clearchus in the post of honour, is appointed to lead the van. Xenophon and Timasion, as the youngest and most active, take charge of the rear. To remove every impediment to rapidity of action, all superfluous baggage, by Xenophon's advice, is destroyed. Intelligence having reached him that some thriving villages lay a few miles distant on their line of route, it was determined at once to advance and occupy them for the night, lest, in anticipation of this movement, they might be plundered or destroyed by the enemy.²

Attention must here be somewhat further directed to a question on which we have already touched: What had hitherto been Xenophon's position in the Cyreian army; what his duties in the camp or the field? The Historian has afforded no clear information on this point, although one certainly of some importance in his own history, and that of the events

¹ III. ii. 7.² III. i. ii.

in which he now appears as principal actor. Making every allowance for the effect which his energetic conduct in this emergency could not fail to produce on his companions in trouble, it certainly seems strange that a man without experience in the profession of arms, or who, at least, as he himself informs us, had not hitherto served either as officer or soldier in this army, should have been suddenly raised to the command of 2000 troops, over the heads of their own veteran officers. Yet there is no appearance of hesitation as to the choice, or even of the existence of rival claims. The next in command to Proxenus, Hieronymus the Elean, is mentioned in the sequel¹ as cordially supporting the new general's measures; and a factious attempt to obstruct them is suppressed, and its author punished, by a process as summary as that by which Xenophon had been appointed.²

Defective however as his claims may on first view appear, such as he possessed will perhaps, if closely examined, be found both reasonable in themselves, and more likely to weigh with his constituents, than had they rested on more strictly professional grounds. Although not by profession a soldier, there can be no doubt, from the tenor of his narrative, that he did good service in the field, and in a highly honourable quality. From his interview with Cyrus before the battle, it appears that he was then attached to the Greek army. That he was not however performing what, in modern military language, is called regimental duty, even had we not his own assurance to that effect, may be inferred from his having been on horseback. The Greeks were at that time entirely

¹ III. i. 34.

² III. i. 26. sq.

destitute of cavalry. But, cavalry soldiers excepted, the privilege of serving on horseback was limited, then as at present, to Generals, Field-officers of battalions, or persons attached to the former as what are now called Staff-officers. Xenophon assures us that he acted in neither of the former capacities. He must therefore be presumed to have served in the latter, as Military Legate, or Adjutant as we should call it, to his friend Proxenus. But the terms of his description imply something more. As Cyrus passed along the line, making the last inspection of his troops before the engagement, Xenophon rides up to him and asks whether he has any instructions. No soldier of a well disciplined army could have ventured to quit his post, still less to force himself on the presence of the commander-in-chief in such a manner, unless in the exercise of some confidential functions. That Xenophon was not taking a liberty, or acting in any unusual mode, is evident from the sequel of the narrative, where the prince, in reply to the question, gives him certain orders, with an injunction to communicate them, not to Clearchus or Proxenus, but to the whole Greek army. All this seems to justify the further inference, that the Historian was here acting as Field-adjutant, not so much of Proxenus as of Cyrus himself; as a medium of communication between head-quarters and the Hellenic force.

A man thus employed and trusted must have possessed, however acquired, a competent knowledge of military affairs. It further appears, from the strategic measures suggested by himself immediately after his promotion, that he was already master, the fruit perhaps of his youthful studies, of much of that strictly technical military science which he is so

fond of parading in his works. These qualifications, on the part of the friend of Proxenus, to command his division after his death, were not perhaps the weaker, that he had not himself actually served in that division. His pretensions stood on separate and higher grounds than those of the Captains or Centurions, whose drooping spirits his energy and eloquence had so greatly helped to restore.

He takes
the lead in
conducting
the retreat.

6. From the date of Xenophon's election as successor to Proxenus, his narrative is not only a history of the retreat of the Ten thousand, but an autobiography of the author during the fifteen months which that retreat occupied. While ostensibly but one of a council of generals, Xenophon was, or represents himself to have been, the guide and director of the army on its arduous homeward march. No other name but his own occurs as the author of beneficial changes in its tactics, discipline, or commissariat. He plans and executes the more important manœuvres, and takes the lead in all negotiations for the common interest with the States or rulers whose territory they cross. He is in fact, or at least in his own narrative appears to be, the guardian genius, the regulating mind of the whole body.

It is not our intention, nor does it belong to our office, to describe in detail the adventures of this celebrated retreat, so familiar to the well informed reader from Xenophon's original work, or from an abundance of secondary sources. A concise view of its leading vicissitudes will suffice, extended here and there, as may be required for better illustration of the Historian's character and influence. We shall also be content for the present to adopt his narrative as our sole guide, reserving for another place such

remarks as may occur on the strictly historical value of that narrative, in itself, or as tested by collateral authorities.

The policy of the Great King in dealing with the Greek army after the death of Cyrus, may be compared to that of a spider, who has entangled in his web a prisoner stronger than himself, or so strong as to render the risks of an open conflict greater than any advantage likely to accrue from the victory. His first object, if it can be done with safety, is to destroy his enemy ; his next, to help him out of his durance¹, but in so crippled a condition as may incapacitate him from measures of reprisal or revenge. The Greeks were too numerous and strong to be safely enlisted as mercenaries, as had been suggested by some of their own leaders in treating with the royal commissioners. The experience of the late battles, which so clearly showed the inability, of the rabble of ill-trained Barbarians forming the bulk of the Persian army, to cope with Greek warriors, held out no inducement to renew hostilities in regular form. The destruction of the principal Greek officers, which it was hoped would intimidate them into submission, had proved but the means of substituting more energetic leaders for those they had lost. Persian intrigue had in fact hitherto proved successful solely in drawing them over, in the course of their march with Tissaphernes,

¹ See Xenophon's remarks (III. ii. 23. sq.) on the king's fear, founded on past experience, lest they should, instead of retreating, settle themselves as a military colony in some defensible part of his dominions. This explains much of the difficulty which Mr. Grote has found, as Voltaire and others had found before him, in accounting for the non-destruction of the Greeks by the overwhelming force of their enemies. Hist. of Gr. vol. VIII. p. 100. alibi; Voltaire ap. Daunou, Cours d'Etudes Histor. tom. XI. pp. 414. 418.

from the west to the east bank of the Tigris. The importance attached by the enemy to this movement, appears from the cunning manœuvres to which he had resorted for securing its execution.¹ An insurmountable barrier was thus interposed to their journey westward, through the rich home province of Mesopotamia ; and the only route open to them now necessarily lay, after a few weeks' journey along the river bank, across rugged mountain districts, where it was hoped the warlike population, aided by the approaching winter season, would effect their destruction with little trouble or risk to the royal army. The operations of the latter were now therefore limited, so long as the retreat lay through an open country, to harassing the Greek flanks and rear ; and, when they were forced to strike into the mountain region, cooperating where practicable by cavalry movements with the guerilla warfare of the natives.

March up
the Tigris.

On the morning after their last council of war, the Greeks, late in the autumn of 401 B.C., set out on their march northwards up the left bank of the Tigris, with a view of ultimately crossing its stream and that of the Euphrates, at some fordable part of the upper course of each river, and then making their way across the mountains whence both issued, to the Greek colonial settlements on the south shore of the Euxine. The first short day's journey was greatly impeded by the assaults of the Persian horse and archers. The Greeks had no cavalry ; and their archers, owing to the superior range of the Persian bows, were no match for their adversaries. During a day's halt, Xenophon succeeded in organising a portion of the baggage-horses, with the

¹ II. iv. 15. sqq. : conf. III. ii. 22.

few practised riders of the army, into a troop of about fifty horsemen ; and in effecting such improvements on the missile weapons of his own light troops, that on the subsequent day he was able with his rear-guard to beat off the hostile skirmishers. For nineteen days, including three of rest in a secure position and fertile district, they continued their route along the river-bank, still harassed by the Persian force under Tissaphernes. His attempt however to cut off their passage through a mountainous tract, by occupying strong positions around or in advance of their line of march, was baffled by a counter-mancœuvre, skillfully planned and vigorously executed by Xenophon.¹

From this point, on the twentieth day's march, the army, owing to the rugged nature of the river-bank, was obliged to strike into the mountain district of Carduchia.² This region was inhabited by tribes recognising no allegiance to the Persian king, whose attempts to reduce them had at times been attended with fearful destruction to the invading armies. The Greeks endeavoured, by abstaining from plunder, or any kind of provocation, to conciliate the good will of these Barbarians, hoping to induce them, in consideration of their common hostility to the Persians, to grant the army a safe passage through their country. But the negotiation failed. The natives, abandoning their villages, withdrew their property to the surrounding fastnesses, and directed against the invaders their most effective means of obstructive hostility. The passage through this region occupied a week of constant fighting by night and day, in every form of mountain warfare ; ambuscades, surprises, attack and

Cardu-
chian
mountains.

Continued
hard fight-
ing.

¹ III. iii. iv.

² III. v.

defence of heights and passes; and Xenophon describes the losses sustained, as greater than all previously inflicted by the arms either of Tissaphernes or Artaxerxes.¹

On clearing the last defiles of these mountains, they encamped for the night on the banks of the Centrites. This river separates the country of the Carduchians from Armenia, where the supremacy of the Great King was fully recognised. In the morning they were greeted by the reappearance, on the opposite bank, of the imperial troops, prepared to dispute their passage. The whole day was spent in vain attempts to discover a practicable ford. The Carduchians were also seen assembling on the heights in the rear, ready to make common cause with their old enemies, in destroying the Hellenic intruder; and night closed in upon the army disheartened by its alarming position. In this emergency Xenophon was again favoured with a divine communication. He dreamt that he was bound in chains, which, of their own accord, loosened and fell off. Rising with the dawn, he proceeded to the quarters of Chirisophus, and informing him that he had now hopes of affairs taking a prosperous turn, he related his dream. Chirisophus was much gratified by the news, and before daybreak the whole council of generals assembled for sacrifice. The auspices being propitious, orders were issued to the troops to take breakfast. While Xenophon was engaged with his own meal, two young soldiers ran into his tent, "for," he adds, "all knew that they were free to approach him, " whether at his hour of breakfast or dinner, or even

¹ IV. i. ii.

“ to awaken him when asleep, if they had anything
 “ to communicate touching the welfare of the army.”
 These men informed him, that while gathering fire-wood along the river-edge, they had observed a part of the stream which appeared to them fordable, and also where the banks were inaccessible to cavalry; that they had stripped and tried the depth of the water, which scarcely reached their hips; so that they crossed and recrossed without difficulty. This satisfactory first step towards the fulfilment of the divine intimation is inaugurated with renewed sacrifice; and in the sequel, by a series of bold manœuvres, planned, executed, and carefully described by Xenophon, the enemy is baffled and defeated at all points, and the whole army brought over in safety to the opposite bank.¹

After five days' march they were met, entering Western Armenia, by Tiribazus, satrap of that province, with whom it was agreed that they should be supplied with provisions and allowed to pass unmolested through his country, on condition of their abstaining from acts of violence. On the evening of the third day after this arrangement, they were overtaken by winter, in a group of opulent villages. On that night and the following days the snow fell thick, causing much distress to the men, which Xenophon exerted himself to mitigate, sharing their hardships, and encouraging them by his example to maintain bodily warmth by active exercise. During a few days' halt at this place, they were informed by a Persian captured at the outposts, that Tiribazus, who since they entered his province had watched their

Western
Armenia.

The army
overtaken
by winter.

¹ IV. iii.

movements with an armed force, had taken up a position in advance, with a view of attacking them on the ensuing day's march. Guided by this man, Chirisophus and Xenophon, with a portion of the army, anticipated the satrap's supposed intentions, by an assault on his own camp, which on their approach he abandoned, leaving a rich booty in their hands.¹

Fords the
Euphrates.

Sufferings
of the men.

7. On the day following, they continued their route through deep snow, during eight days, fording the Euphrates on the fourth not far from its source. Several of these were days of intense suffering to the men, numbers of whom, in spite of a solemn sacrifice to Boreas, which Xenophon describes as greatly mitigating the severity of the cold, were frozen to death or escaped with the loss of limbs or of eyesight. Others were destroyed by the enemy, who hung on their march, cutting off the disabled and stragglers. The principal scene of these disasters was the rear under the charge of Xenophon; whose efforts to alleviate them, and to maintain the spirit of the men, partly by conciliatory, partly by rigorous measures, are eloquently described in his narrative.

On the ninth day they took up their quarters in a group of villages, where they met with a kind reception, and enjoyed seven days of repose and good cheer.² On the eighth they renewed their march, still through snow, accompanied by one of the village magistrates, whose friendship Xenophon had conciliated, and who consented to act as their guide. After two days' journey however he returned home, irritated by insulting treatment received from Chirisophus. Xenophon was much hurt by this conduct

¹ IV. iv.

² IV. v.

of his colleague, which he describes as the only serious ground of difference between them during the retreat. Nine days' further march with better weather brought them to the edge of a plain, the pass into which was guarded by a large force of native tribes strongly posted on the neighbouring heights. In a council of generals, a proposal to attack the hostile position was set aside, and, on Xenophon's suggestion, a favourite manœuvre of his own, successfully employed on former occasions, was preferred. This stratagem consisted in secretly sending a detachment to occupy still higher ground in the neighbourhood of the enemy, and by thus menacing him with assault both from above and below, forcing him to dislodge and retire. It was here also attended with complete success.¹

The subsequent sixteen days' march was occupied in great part with hill-fighting, similar to that in which they had been engaged in the Carduchian mountains, and with tribes still fiercer than they had yet encountered. On reaching the plains on the other side, they rested three days among villages well stocked with provisions.²

Continued
hard fighting.

Four days more brought them to a large city called Gymnias, the governor of which received them kindly, and at their departure supplied them with a guide who conducted them in five days to the summit of a hill commanding a distant view of the sea. The prospect was hailed with a burst of joy by the whole army. From thence, by a week's march, with little further serious opposition, they reached, in the spring of 400 B.C., the flourishing Greek colony and

View of
the sea.

Arrival at
Trapezus
in spring,
400 B.C.

¹ IV. vi.

² IV. vii. 1—18.

seaport of Trapezus. Here they were hospitably received, and remained thirty days, during which sacrifices were performed and games celebrated, in honour of their long wished-for arrival among friends and fellow-Hellenes.¹

The point to which the army looked as the end of its wanderings was Byzantium, on the Bosphorus, the central station of a Spartan navarch and provincial Chief commissioner. Anaxibius, who now held this high office, was an old friend of Chirisophus. The troops therefore trusted the more confidently to his aid, either for the means of return to their homes, or for employment in the Spartan service. The land route to Byzantium was in great part open along a coast studded with Greek cities, where they might expect the same kind treatment as they had experienced from the Trapezuntines. But the hardships of the late march had given the soldiers a distaste for land journeys of any kind. They were determined, as expressed by one of their popular spokesmen, "to have done with this perpetual marching and running, and getting under arms, and forming phalanx, and mounting guard, and fighting, and packing and unpacking bag and baggage. Let us have no more of such work; but now that we have the sea before us, let us, stretched at our ease on the deck like Ulysses, sail home at once to Hellas." It was resolved therefore to prosecute their course by sea, and Chirisophus was dispatched to Byzantium to procure ships. During his absence, means were also adopted by Xenophon for arresting such trading vessels, as should touch at or approach the

¹ iv. vii. 19. sqq., viii.

port of Trapezus, and obliging them, for a certain hire, to serve as transports. He also took the precaution, in case the supply should fall short, of sending messages to the towns along the coast, requesting that the roads might be put in repair for the passage of the army.¹

Two companies having been cut off and their leader slain while foraging in the interior, and provisions being scarce in the camp, Xenophon, encouraged by favourable auspices, led out one half of the army against a neighbouring mountain tribe called Drilæ, habitual foes of the Trapezuntines, who supplied the Greeks with guides into the hostile territory. After some hard fighting, an attempt to obtain possession of the chief fortress of the enemy was defeated, by the combined strength of the place and valour of the garrison. The destruction of the assailants appeared imminent; when a fire accidentally broke out in the suburb between them and their pursuers, by aid of which they succeeded, with trifling loss and a good stock of plunder, in effecting their retreat to their camp.²

Attack on
the Drilæ.

After a month spent at Trapezus, vainly awaiting the return of Chirisophus, it was determined to proceed with the means at their command. The vessels collected by Xenophon proved sufficient for the women and children, the men above forty, and a portion of the baggage. The rest of the army took the road to Cerasus, another Greek seaport, where both divisions arrived on the third day. Here they remained ten days, during which the army was numbered, and found to comprise in all eight thousand six hundred

Cerasus.

¹ v. i.

² v. ii.

men. A division was also made of the spoil collected in their late campaign. A tenth of the whole was jointly devoted to Apollo and Diana, and was made over in allotments to each of the generals, to be disposed of in honour of the two deities. Of the allotment assigned to Xenophon, the portion set apart for Apollo was dedicated in the Athenian treasury of the Delphic sanctuary. That belonging to Diana was deposited in her temple at Ephesus, where it remained until his resettlement in Greece eight years afterwards, and was then laid out in the purchase of ground, and the endowment of a temple to the goddess, at the Historian's favourite abode of Scillus in the Elean territory.¹

The Mosynœcians.

From Cerasus the army journeyed in the same manner, partly by sea, partly by a ten days' march through the interior, to Cotyora, another Greek maritime city, a colony and dependency of the neighbouring republic of Sinope. The first part of the land route lay through the mountain district of the Mosynœci, who formed an alliance with the Greeks for a joint attack on some neighbouring hostile tribes, whose country the army was to traverse on the subsequent days. On crossing the frontier, the Mosynœcians, rashly approaching a stronghold of the natives, were surprised and defeated; but on the following day Xenophon, with his combined force, dispersing the enemy, took and plundered their chief city.²

Cotyora.

At Cotyora the Greeks met with a less friendly reception than at Trapezus and Cerasus. The authorities refused either to admit them within the city, or afford them a market without the walls. They

¹ v. iii.

² v. iv. v. 1—3.

were thus obliged to exact supplies from the surrounding district. Accounts of these proceedings having reached Sinope, the camp was visited by envoys from that republic; one of whom, an orator of provincial celebrity, named Hecatonymus, complained, in a pompous speech, of the mode in which their allies had been treated by the strangers. He concluded with a threat, that unless satisfaction was afforded, the Sinopian government would form an alliance with Corylas, prince of Paphlagonia, the district next on their line of route westward, for common resistance to the invaders. Xenophon, in reply, complained that the Cotyoritans alone of the Greek cities which they had visited, had treated them in an unfriendly manner; but denied that the troops had given any reasonable ground of offence. As to the threat of a Paphlagonian alliance, he turned the tables on the Sinopian orator by remarking that, as he happened to know, Corylas had long been desirous of conquering their city, with the maritime district bordering on his own possessions, and that he would readily take the Cyreians into his pay, should matters come to extremity between them and the Sinopians. The other envoys here perceived that their spokesman had overshot the mark. They lost no time therefore in coming to friendly terms with the army by appropriate explanations. They also offered their services in providing vessels sufficient to transport the whole force to Byzantium or to Heraclea, from which place Byzantium was easily accessible by land or by sea.¹

8. About this time Xenophon conceived the project of bringing his own wanderings and those of his

Xenophon's
scheme of

¹ v. v. 4—25., vi. 1—14.

colonial
settlement.

Dissen-
sions in
the army.

fellow-warriors to a close, by establishing the army as a colony at some eligible site on the Euxine coast; and thus, as a founder and legislator, acquiring a new claim to distinction in the eyes of his countrymen. As he was wont in similar cases, he consulted the gods by sacrifice. On this occasion, he called to his assistance one Silanus, a professional soothsayer, who had accompanied the army, and had been richly rewarded by Cyrus for the skilful exercise of his functions in a case of interest to the prince. The result was favourable according to the rules of the art. But the augur happened to have no taste for colonisation, being anxious to return home with his treasure. Seeing no immediate prospect of attaining his object in safety were he deprived of his military escort, he gave publicity in the camp to what had passed. The feeling of the army is described by Xenophon as adverse rather than favourable to his project; and it seems, from the sequel of his account, that the adverse interest greatly predominated. The leaders of the opposition were his colleague in command Timasion, and a Bœotian officer named Thorax, who had at all times shown an unfriendly feeling towards him. The better to counteract his present scheme, the two confederates represented to some Sinopian and Heracleote traders, then at Cotyora, that unless they supplied funds, to help the army on its voyage to the Bosphorus, there was great risk of its settling as a colony in their neighbourhood: "Xenophon being prepared, as soon as the transports arrived, to plead want of means to cover the expense of a long voyage, as an argument with the men for seeking their fortunes in some less distant quarter." The intimation had

its effect; and it was agreed that the funds should be ready when required. On the strength of this engagement, Timasion, in a council-general, guaranteed to the troops, on condition of their rejecting Xenophon's proposal, a certain rate of pay monthly till they reached the Hellespont, his native district, where he promised them abundant means of providing for themselves. Severe reflexions were also thrown out against Xenophon, for thus privately sacrificing about new projects, on his own account. Xenophon replied, that it had all along been his custom to consult, both with his own mind and with the gods, regarding any scheme which he considered for the common good; that he had however as little the desire, as he had the power, to force any measure on them against their will. Being now therefore assured that they were supplied with money as well as transports, he would himself move a vote for the continuance of the voyage homewards. He added, that as they were determined to proceed, it would be wise to do so in one united body; he therefore suggested a further resolution, that whoever should leave the army until the whole body agreed to break up, should be held guilty of an offence.¹

Both resolutions were passed by acclamation. The single voice raised loudly but in vain against the latter of the two was that of Silanus, who felt himself caught in his own snare; his intention being, as Xenophon knew, to decamp with his treasure, on the first safe opportunity that might offer. The dilemma into which Timasion and his adherents were brought was still more perplexing. For the Sinopians and

¹ v. vi. 15—33.

Heracleans, on learning that Xenophon had himself come forward with a motion for continuing the voyage home, sent the ships, as formerly agreed, but declined any advance of money. Xenophon's late opponents therefore, dreading the wrath of the troops on being disappointed of their promised pay, had recourse to him to help them out of their difficulty. Assuring him that they had changed their minds, they now offered to support him in the colonial scheme they had lately rejected, by seizing and appropriating the Colchian district of Phasis. But he declined any further concern in the matter. The soldiers in the meantime became aware that intrigues were carrying on; and Neon, a Spartan, lieutenant of Chirisophus, persuaded them, that Xenophon had formed a scheme with the other generals, to entrap the army into his project of colonial settlement. Public indignation now broke out strongly against him, and he was even led to apprehend violence. Upon this he summoned another council, and in a long address vindicated his conduct. Suppressing all allusion to the unfair proceedings of Timasion, he showed the impossibility of his having been concerned in the recent counterplots. He also dwelt forcibly on the lamentable change that had taken place in the moral condition of the army, and the necessity of some reform in its discipline. He narrated in detail several acts of murderous outrage committed since their arrival on the sea coast, not merely by individuals, but by large bodies, under responsible leaders, against friendly native tribes, or citizens of the towns where they had been hospitably treated. These breaches of the law of nations were the more injurious to the common interest, that in at least one instance they had

resulted in ignominious defeat and loss of life to the aggressors.

This appeal had the desired effect. It was resolved that the perpetrators of those crimes should be brought to justice. The conduct of the generals since the commencement of the retreat was submitted to a court-martial, consisting of the whole body of captains; and three were subjected to penalties for neglect of duty, or mismanagement of the public money. The attempts to inculcate Xenophon, consisting mainly of charges of severity towards the soldiers under his command, recoiled on their authors; eliciting from the court a recognition of the lenity and impartiality, as well as strictness of his discipline, with censures on the conduct of his accusers.¹

A sufficient number of transports having been procured, the army, after upwards of six weeks' sojourn at Cotyora, embarked, and a voyage of thirty-six hours brought them to Harmenë, a port in the neighbourhood of Sinope. Here they were at length rejoined by Chirisophus from Byzantium, bringing nothing back with him but the vessel in which he sailed, and a message from the navarch Anaxibius, to make the best of their way to the Bosphorus, where he engaged to provide them with military service.² Harmenë.

During the five days' sojourn at Harmenë, the army resolved to appoint some one of the generals to the The
supreme
command

¹ v. vi. 34. sqq., vii. viii.

² vi. i. 1—16. This coasting voyage from Cotyora to Sinope is described over again, in somewhat poetical strain, in vi. ii. 1.; apparently through some blunder of the Historian's memory, or in the arrangement of his notes. The explanation of Buttmann and others (Schneider ad loc.) seems hardly sufficient to save Xenophon's consistency; and Krüger's arguments (De Auth. et Integr. Anab. p. 35.) are not more valid against the genuine character of the passage.

conferred
on Chirisophus.

supreme command, as a more effective mode of conducting operations, than where all questions required to be submitted to a council of war. Xenophon gives plainly, though indirectly, to understand, that the chief motive for this change of system, was the dissatisfaction felt by the troops, as they approached their own country, at the thought of returning with little in their purses, and the expectation that by their achievements under a single energetic leader, they might be enabled to make what they considered a more creditable appearance on their arrival in Greece. The first offer of the new dignity was made to Xenophon, who, gratified by the proposal, was ready, in so far as personal feelings were involved, to accept it. Doubtful however on other accounts, he had recourse to the higher powers; when neither sacrifices, omens, nor dreams, proved satisfactory. He therefore declined the distinction, on the ground that to confer it on an Athenian, where there were Lacedæmonian officers possessing claims, would be a slight to the acknowledged military precedence of Sparta, and might give offence to the Spartan provincial governors, whom it was important to conciliate. The choice then fell on Chirisophus. This brave and disinterested warrior, in accepting the office, expressed his readiness to have acted under his old colleague, but confirmed Xenophon's ground of refusal, having himself become aware at Byzantium, that attempts were making to prejudice the Lacedæmonian authorities against him.¹

Heraclea.
Mutiny
and dis-
ruption of
the army.

9. From Harmenë a two days' voyage brought them to Heraclea, where they were kindly received and supplied with provisions. But this handsome treatment

¹ VI. i. 17 sqq.

was ill requited. In a council of the troops it was moved by one Lycon, an Achæan, and resolved by the majority, that contributions of money should be levied from the place. Chirisophus and Xenophon were deputed as a mission to make the demand. Both refused to take part in so scandalous a proceeding. The office was then undertaken by Lycon himself and two Arcadian officers. In the interview with the magistrates threats of hostile measures were thrown out in case of non-compliance. The Heraclæotes asked and obtained time for consideration; when forthwith, collecting their outlying property within the walls, they withdrew the provision market on which the Greek camp depended for supplies, shut their gates, and appearing in arms on the ramparts, set the intruders at defiance.¹

The mutineers, irritated by this disappointment, and denouncing the generals as its authors, persuaded the great mass of their Arcadian and Achæan comrades, comprising about one half of the army, to desert their legitimate officers, and appoint leaders of their own. The army was thus separated into three divisions: the Arcado-Achæans, in number about 4500, and the troops who adhered to Chirisophus and Xenophon, forming two divisions of about 2000 men each. It was arranged between these two generals that they too should prosecute their route for the present separately, each with his own division. The Arcado-Achæans sailed first, eager for the plunder of Bithynia, on the coast of which country they proposed to land at the port of Calpe. Chirisophus and Xenophon also directed their course to this place, as the next convenient resting-point on

¹ VI. ii. 8.

their way to the Bosphorus; Chirisophus proceeding by land, while Xenophon arranged to perform half the distance by sea, and the rest by land. Xenophon was at this time strongly tempted to throw up his command and leave the army; but the sacrifices were not favourable to the step. The mortification inflicted on Chirisophus by the late proceedings was such, says Xenophon, "as rendered further service "with the army hateful to him;" and he sickened and died soon after his arrival at Calpe.

Its re-
muster at
Calpe.

The marauding expedition of the Arcado-Achæans was attended with well-merited disaster. While busy in plundering the Bithynian villages, they were attacked and overpowered by the natives, many of them slain, the rest blockaded on a height where they had rallied and entrenched themselves. From this critical position they were rescued by Xenophon, whose land route lay at no great distance from the spot, and who hastened to their succour. At his approach the Bithynians retired, and the two divisions continued their march in company to Calpe, where that of Chirisophus had already arrived. The Arcado-Achæans were abundantly satiated with their brief experience of separate campaigning. On the motion of their own leaders it was resolved, that any fresh attempt to create division in the army should be punished with death, and that the former generals should be reinstated in their commands. Neon, lieutenant of the deceased Chirisophus, was appointed his successor.¹

Xenophon enlarges in glowing terms on the many advantages which the site of Calpe held out for the foundation of a city. He does not inform us whether

¹ vi. ii. iii. iv. 11.

there was still a party in the camp favourable to his scheme of colonisation, and desirous of reopening the question; or whether he himself entertained any such view. But the ensuing transactions went far to justify the suspicions that arose, of some such project being again in agitation.

After a short repose at Calpe, he reminded the troops that their engagements for a supply of vessels had expired; that their provisions were nearly exhausted; that they must therefore make up their minds to renew their old occupation of foraging and fighting their way by land through a hostile country. On proceeding to inaugurate the march, the sacrifices, day after day, proved inauspicious. Taunts having been thrown out against Xenophon, of tampering with the rites in furtherance of his colonial schemes, he the next day invited the whole army to witness the ceremony. But during a week of daily trial no change took place. The soldiers now crowded round his tent, complaining of want of food. But he refused either to commence the march, or to send out foraging parties, until the auspices improved. It soon became difficult even to continue the sacrifices, for want of victims, for which they were obliged to have recourse to the draught cattle, but still in vain. The men were now actually starving, when Neon, the successor of Chirisophus, offered to lead as many as volunteered their services, on a foraging party among the neighbouring villages. About two thousand took part in the expedition. While engaged in collecting spoil they were surprised by a large body of cavalry, sent by the satrap Pharnabazus to aid the Bithynians in obstructing the march of the strangers into his own Phrygian province. About

Disasters
at Calpe.

five hundred were slain, and the rest forced to take refuge in the neighbouring mountains.

Intelligence of this disaster was brought to Xenophon, while still occupied in fruitless attempts, by slaughtering his draught oxen, to procure the consent of the gods to his putting his army in motion. An alarm was soon after spread, that the Barbarians had driven in the outposts and were preparing to attack the camp. The whole army passed the night under arms, and in the morning commenced fortifying their position.¹ In the afternoon of the same day, a vessel arrived with supplies from Heraclea; and on Xenophon, the next morning, renewing the rites, the auspices proved favourable. He now took the field with his whole disposable force. On reaching the scene of Neon's defeat, after burying the bodies of their slain comrades, they resumed, with better success, the interrupted plunder of the villages. Soon after, they fell in with the satrap's force, so strongly posted in a woody ravine, that the older generals discountenanced any attempt to dislodge them. But Xenophon declared for an immediate assault, and, after a smart action, the Persians were beaten and dispersed, and the victors, about sunset, were safely housed in their quarters.²

Some days after these events, Cleander, the Spartan harmost of Byzantium, arrived at Calpe, with powers from Anaxibius to deal with the Cyreïan force as he might deem most advisable. He found the camp in a state of disturbance, from the attempts of disorderly bodies of soldiery, acting under rapacious leaders, to appropriate portions of the common stock of booty. Cleander's conduct on this occasion gained him the

¹ VI. iv.

² VI. v.

confidence of the troops, with the friendship of Xenophon; and he was urged to assume the supreme command, and conduct the army to Byzantium. He would readily have complied, could he have procured the sanction of the gods; but after sacrificing on the customary three days without success, he took his leave, promising his best services on their arrival at his seat of office. After a six days' march, without further hostile obstruction, they reached Chrysopolis, on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus opposite Byzantium.¹

On hearing of their arrival, Anaxibius, at the instance of the satrap Pharnabazus, whom he wished to conciliate, and who was anxious to rid his province of the armed intruders, invited the generals to a conference, and promised, on their conducting the army to the European shore, to provide the men with service and pay. To this they consented, Xenophon alone excepted, who seems henceforth to have considered his engagement with his troops at an end, and had made up his mind to return home. He agreed however, at the request of Anaxibius, to bring his division across, and resign his command on landing in Europe. He was visited at the same time by messengers from Seuthes, a Thracian potentate, with proposals to take the Crysians into his service. But Xenophon declined any negotiation, on the ground of his being about to leave the army.²

10. On crossing the channel to Byzantium, the men discovered that they had been duped. Instead of wages and employment, they received an order from Anaxibius to quit the city, and take up their quarters without the walls, where he would communicate his

Byzantium :
tyrannical
conduct of
the Spartan
authorities.

¹ vi. vi.² vii. i. 1—6.

further intentions. Vexed and disappointed at this reception, they showed little inclination to obey. Xenophon was at that moment taking leave of his friend, the harmost Cleander, before setting out on his journey home, but was advised by that officer to remain, and persuade his comrades to comply with the navarch's order; otherwise he might himself be made responsible for their disobedience. His influence was successfully exerted; and the troops marched out. Anaxibius then assembled the officers, and directed them to conduct the army to the Thracian Chersonesus, a hundred and fifty miles distant, where they would be engaged by the Spartan commissioner of that district; and that they might supply themselves with provisions in the villages on the route. Infuriated by this treatment, from one who had held out so many fair promises of friendly service, the men rose in a mass, assaulted the city, and obtained possession of the lower town, the port, and shipping; while Anaxibius, with his chief officers and the local magistrates, took refuge in the citadel. The insurgents then invited Xenophon to place himself at their head, and give effect to his long cherished project, of becoming founder of a state "abounding in ships, and stores, and gallant men." Xenophon, who, when the tumult arose, was again on the point of departure, remonstrated with them on their imprudence. He admitted the injustice of the navarch's conduct, but pointed out the madness of setting at defiance the whole power of Sparta, who, without reference to the faults of her agents, would not fail speedily to reassert her supremacy in one of her most important dependencies, and punish those who had presumed to usurp it. His representations had the

desired effect; the place was given up, and order was restored.¹

The Historian's account of this affair, with the subsequent treatment of the army by the Spartan provincial governors, during its several months' sojourn at Byzantium, while far from creditable to himself², places the character of those eminent personages in a most unfavourable light. Cleander indeed proved himself in all his dealings a humane and honourable man. He was however about this time superseded as harmost by Aristarchus, a worthy rival of Anaxibius in the heartless brutality of his conduct. Of the generous spirit of sympathy in which the army had been greeted by their fellow-Hellenes of the Euxine colonies, and which their achievements in a cause favoured by Sparta, might have been expected the more readily to insure them from Spartan officers, not a spark can be discerned in their reception by these petty viceregal despots. The only motive of Anaxibius, from the first, for inviting them to his seat of government, was, that their presence enabled him to exercise influence on the neighbouring Persian satrap. When that purpose was served, his object, as Xenophon assures us, became to rid himself of them, by whatever means, as speedily as possible; and the policy of Aristarchus, opposed as he was to Anaxibius in other respects, was the same in his treatment of the Cyreians.

Shortly after these transactions, the army entered into a contract of service with a Theban military adventurer named Cæratadas, on apparently advantageous terms. Xenophon now took his formal leave, and commenced his voyage home, having been ho-

¹ VII. i. 8—32.

² See Ch. xiii. § 6.

noured by his new patron Anaxibius with a passage on board his own galley as far as Parium, whither the latter was himself bound, for the purpose of conferring with Pharnabazus on their common interests. Touching at Cyzicus, they fell in with Aristarchus, the new harmost, proceeding to his seat of government; who announced to Anaxibius, that his term of office was expired, his successor in command on his way out, and daily to be expected. At parting Anaxibius instructed Aristarchus, on arriving at Byzantium, to sell into slavery as many of the Cyreian soldiers as he found still in the town; and four hundred, as the Historian informs us, were so seized and sold. A similar order, Xenophon observes, had formerly been given to Cleander, but not, it need scarcely be added, complied with by that estimable officer. On arriving at Parium, Anaxibius found his influence with Pharnabazus at an end. Apprised that another navarch had been appointed, the satrap wisely resolved to transfer his confidence from the ex-admiral to the newly installed harmost; and treating Anaxibius with marked neglect, commenced negotiations with Aristarchus on the points at issue between the two governments.¹

Anaxibius, in revenge, determined to bring back to the satrap's province the unwelcome visitors from whom he had lately delivered it. He therefore dispatched Xenophon across the channel, with instructions to collect the whole Cyreian army, or as many as could be brought together, at Perinthus on the opposite coast, and gave him a written order to the Perintheans to supply transports for the passage to Parium. During Xenophon's voyage to the latter

¹ VII. i. 33. sqq., ii. 1—7.

port, the engagement between his countrymen and Cœratadas had fallen to the ground, from the inability of that adventurer to fulfil its terms. The army was now in a very distressed condition; and the generals who remained in command were divided in opinion, whether to close with renewed overtures from the Thracian king Seuthes, or to adopt the unsatisfactory alternative of a march to the Chersonesus, formerly proposed by Anaxibius. In this state of things the proposal of Xenophon was accepted by the soldiers. Pharnabazus however and the new harmost were more than a match for the retiring navarch. While Xenophon was preparing the transports, Aristarchus came down to Perinthus, and forbade the men to embark, or the pilots to take them across. On Xenophon pleading his instructions from Anaxibius to bring them over, the harmost replied that he, and not Anaxibius, was now master there; and that he would throw the first man who dared to go on board into the sea. On the following day he summoned the officers to a conference, which Xenophon did not attend, having been apprised that he ran risk of being placed under arrest, and either sent prisoner to Pharnabazus, or disposed of in some still more summary manner. In this new difficulty he had recourse to his divine counsellors, inquiring, more especially, whether it would be desirable for the army and himself to close with the offers of Seuthes. The answer proved favourable; the terms negotiated by Xenophon with their new patron were satisfactory, and the Greeks passed over to his quarters. Neon alone, with 800 men under his command, remained behind. This officer, between whom and Xenophon mutual dislike existed, was now entirely in the interest

Service of
the Greeks
under
Seuthes, in
Thrace.

of his countryman Aristarchus. He therefore preferred the offer of service in the Chersonesus, revived by that dignitary, who tempted the rest of the men to a like course by the gracious assurance, "that if they complied no more of them should be sold as slaves."¹

Mæsades, the father of Seuthes, seems to have been connected by blood with the celebrated Sitalces, king of the Odrysians, and to have succeeded to a share of his dominions. This territory had however been wrested from the family by more powerful neighbours; and it was to aid his own limited force in its recovery, that Seuthes had been so desirous of enlisting the Cyreians. After two months' severe winter warfare, resembling that in which they had been engaged on their route from Babylonia to the Euxine coast, Seuthes, through the valour of his Greek allies, was reinstated in his paternal possessions.

During the campaign, his nonpayment of the troops had been a source of irritation against Xenophon; Seuthes complaining of his unseasonable demands of money, while those unfriendly to him in the ranks prejudiced the minds of the soldiers against him, by representing him as lukewarm in their interest, or even as bribed by Seuthes to connive at his attempts to defraud them. Xenophon is at great pains to prove to his comrades, and to his readers, by long orations and elaborate statements, the futility of these charges, and in the end succeeds in vindicating the purity of his conduct. The dispute had just reached a point which threatened open rupture among the conflicting parties, when commissioners arrived from Thimbron, the Spartan harmost of Ionia, with offers of service to the army in a war that had just

¹ VII. ii. iii. 1—6.

broken out between him and the Persian satraps. This new turn of affairs was hailed with satisfaction by Seuthes, who, by making a merit with each party of his readiness to forward the proposed arrangement, hoped to evade his own debt to the Cyreians. So strong however were their claims, that the commissioners joined with Xenophon in exacting payment; and the arrears, mainly through his exertions, were at last obtained, though not to the full amount.¹

11. Xenophon now again became bent on returning home, a course, he observes, which was still open to him, "sentence of banishment not having been yet pronounced against him at Athens."² He was however once more persuaded to continue in command, and deliver over the army in person to Thimbron. Crossing the Hellespont to Lampsacus, in the early spring of 499 B.C., they proceeded through the Troad to Pergamus in Mysia, where Xenophon was hospitably entertained by a Greek lady named Hellas. From her he learned, that in the neighbourhood was situated the castle of Asidatis, a wealthy Persian nobleman, of which, and of the treasure it contained, reported to be great, he would, she assured him, have no difficulty in obtaining possession with a force of 300 men.

Service
under
Thimbron
in Asia.

Xenophon, who describes himself as very poor on landing in Asia, asked³, and obtained, in the customary form, the divine sanction to this enterprise. The assault was made at midnight, but failed. The place was gallantly defended; and succours pouring in from the neighbouring district, the Greeks were forced to retire, with much loss of life, carrying off some slaves and cattle. On the morrow Xenophon, after

Attack on
Asidatis.

¹ VII. iii.—vii.

² VII. vii. 57.

³ VII. viii. 2.

again performing sacrifice, led out his whole army to the attack. Asidatis, unable to cope with so greatly superior a force, abandoned the place, and sought refuge in the neighbouring villages, where he was surrounded, and with his family and goods fell into the hands of his pious assailant. Shortly after this affair Thimbron arrived in the camp, and incorporating the army with his other forces, prosecuted the war as described by Xenophon in his Hellenic history.¹

Sentence of
exile
against
Xenophon.

This transaction closes the "Anabasis," and the autobiography of Xenophon. For our knowledge of his subsequent life, we are still mainly dependent on notices contained in his works, chiefly in the same Anabasis. About the time of his return from Thrace into Asia, he became an exile; a misfortune which appears, from a portion of his narrative above quoted, not to have taken him altogether by surprise. Before touching on the speculative questions connected with this important crisis of his destiny, it will be desirable, with the aid of such imperfect materials as we possess, to complete the foregoing biographical sketch.

His return
to Greece
with Agesilaus.

The next clearly ascertained event of his life, is his having been, four years afterwards (in 495 B.C.), attached to the Spartan king Agesilaus, when in command of the same Lacedæmonian army in Asia Minor, of which Xenophon's old Cyreian comrades now formed a principal part. Where he was, or how he was occupied, during the intermediate period, are points to be reserved for future consideration. He afterwards accompanied Agesilaus on his return through Thrace and Thessaly to Greece, in 494 B.C., to conduct the war against the newly-formed anti-Spartan league of Athens, Corinth, and Thebes; and

¹ VII. vii.

was present at the battle of Coronea¹, where the confederate forces were defeated by his patron. He settled not long after under Spartan auspices² at Scillus, about two miles from Olympia. This small town had been a dependency of the Elean republic, from which it had been wrested by Sparta in a recent quarrel between the two States, and now ranked as a free community under Spartan protection. Here Xenophon, with the spoil of the Cyreian campaign, devoted, as described in a previous page, to Diana, purchased a domain, consisting in great part of hunting-ground, built a temple, with statue, altar, and dedicatory inscription, planted a grove, and consecrated the whole to his divine patroness. He also instituted annual games and other festivities in her honour. A tithe of the annual income was set apart, to defray the charges of hospitality to the numerous visitors who assembled on those occasions. Among the delicacies provided for their entertainment, he mentions the wild boar, deer, and other produce of his own and his son's skill in the chase. He gives a lively description of this establishment, the sacred portion of which he had endeavoured to render, in all respects, a miniature model of the great sanctuary of the Ephesian goddess in her favourite Asiatic seat.³

His settlement at Scillus.

In his retirement of Scillus Xenophon seems to have passed the whole, or the greater part, of the rest of his long life, careless of war or politics, engrossed with his literary undertakings, the education of his children, the worship of his goddess, and the society of his friends; with his farm, the chase, and other field

¹ Anab. v. iii. 6.; Agesil. ii. 9.

² Dinarch. ap. Diog. L. 52.

³ v. iii. 7.

Restora-
tion to his
civic rights.

exercises. His sentence of banishment is said to have been remitted before the close of his life, at the instance of the orator Eubulus of Anaphlystus.¹ That this act of grace was conceded, may be inferred from the tone of his later works; of that for example on Athenian finance, written about 355 B.C.; and of that on the Athenian cavalry service. Both these tracts manifest a greater familiarity with, and interest in, the internal condition of Athens, than seems compatible with a continued exclusion from his rights of citizenship.

His domes-
tic rela-
tions.

Mention occurs of a wife of Xenophon² as in existence before his entry into the service of Cyrus. He would seem however, from allusions in the latter part of the *Anabasis*, to have become a widower before the end of his Persian campaign, and to have also been childless at that epoch. He is stated, on not very high authority, to have brought over from Asia, five years afterwards, a wife or mistress named Philesia³, and two sons. Xenophon himself is silent as to either wife or mistress, but alludes to several sons who resided with him at Scillus. Of the two ascribed to him by other authorities, the one is called Gryllus, the other Diodorus.⁴ Gryllus was slain, fighting on the Athenian side at the battle of Mantinea, in which he greatly distinguished himself⁵; and among the claimants to the honour of having inflicted on Epaminondas his death wound, he is

¹ Istrus ap. Diog. Laert. 59.

² Æschines Socrat. ap. Cicero de Invent. c. 31.; Quintil. v. xi. 27.

³ By Demetrius Magnes ap. Diog. Laert. 52. She is called *Sotira* in the spurious Xenophontean Epistles. See below, § 17. in fine.

⁴ Dinarchus, Diocles, &c., ap. Diog. Laert.

⁵ Ephorus, Aristotle, Hermippus, ap. Diog. Laert. § 53. sq.

perhaps the one in whose favour the greatest weight of testimony is united.¹ The enthusiastic terms in which the Historian eulogises² the valour displayed by the Athenian cavalry, in a skirmish shortly prior to this battle, have been supposed, on plausible grounds, to be inspired by his son's participation in that achievement.³

According to Diogenes Laertius, Xenophon was not permitted to end his days at his Peloponnesian abode. When, on the break up of Spartan ascendancy after the battle of Leuctra, the Eleans reacquired the territory of Scillus, the Historian, as an adherent of the Spartan interest, was, if we may trust that biographer⁴, deprived of his house and lands, and retired to Corinth.⁵ The Eleans repudiated this account. They admitted that on the restoration of their sovereignty in the place, Xenophon's property within its bounds had been made a subject of litigation; but they maintained that he had won his suit, had continued to reside at Scillus, and had been honoured by them at his death with a handsome monument, still shown in the time of Pausanias.⁶ It certainly tells in favour of the Elean tradition, that Xenophon, while so fondly enlarging in the *Anabasis* on his Olympian residence, nowhere, in his works written at a later period, alludes to his ejection from it; an event which, considering his interest in the place, and the sacred character of his connexion with it, would have been tantamount to a second exile. Nor is there a hint in his text of

Close of
his life.

¹ Pausan. ix. xv.: conf. Smith's *Classic. Dict.* in Gryllus.

² Hellen. vii. v. 15.

³ Paus. i. iii.: conf. Krüger, *Hist. Phil. Stud.* ii. p. 282.

⁴ In Xen. § 53. sqq.

⁵ Demetr. Magn. ap. Diog. La. § 56.

⁶ v. vi. 4 sqq.

his having taken up his abode in any other part of Greece.¹

Cause of
his banish-
ment.

Antient
authorities.

12. In reverting to the question regarding the date or cause of the Historian's banishment, it will be proper to have clearly before us the views of the leading authorities, antient and modern, on the subject. On neither point does there seem to have been any material difference in the doctrine of the native commentators, however varied their mode of stating it. The two who have expressed themselves most explicitly are Pausanias and Diogenes Laertius. The former² attributes the Historian's sentence to his having borne arms under Cyrus, whom the Athenians considered their enemy, against his brother Artaxerxes, whom, Pausanias adds, they esteemed friendly to their interests. The date of the sentence is not here specified; but the explanation of its cause is not compatible with its having been passed at a much later period than that above assumed.³ Services rendered to Cyrus being the crime charged, the punishment would naturally follow as soon as the fact of their having been rendered was publicly known; which could not have been long after the arrival of the Greeks at Byzantium. According to Diogenes, Xenophon's offence was that of "Laconism," or undue attachment to the Lacedæmonian interest, the precise kind or degree of which our authority does not specify. His words are: "After his service with Seuthes, Xe-

¹ Schneider's argument, from certain passages of the tract On Athenian finance (iv. 43.), that Xenophon wrote that treatise at Corinth, is fallacious. The geographical definition to which he alludes, would be equally at fault if laid down with reference to Corinth itself.

² v. vi. 4. See Krüger, *De Xenoph. Vit.* p. 276.: cf. a similar notice by Dion. Chrysost. *Orat.* viii. init.

³ p. 284. *supra*.

“ nophon, crossing into Asia, made over the Cyreian army to Agesilaus, king of Sparta, who became his constant friend. About this time he was banished from Athens on account of Laconism.”¹ That Diogenes has here committed the blunder, natural in a careless writer, of confounding Agesilaus with Thimbron, is evident. Substituting therefore the right for the wrong name, the biographer’s definition of the sentence as passed “about the time” when the Cyreians under Xenophon’s guidance entered the Lacedæmonian service, is virtually the same as that given by Pausanias. The Laconism mentioned by Diogenes could not have consisted, as might on a superficial view be supposed, in his having been the means of swelling the Spartan force in Asia; the Athenians being at this time not only in alliance with Sparta, but having contributed a force of 300 cavalry to the army of Thimbron.² They could hardly impute to Xenophon as a crime an act sanctioned by their own example. There can be no doubt that the statements of the two authors mean substantially the same thing. Alliance with Cyrus, the ally of Sparta, and who had been so greatly instrumental to the conquest of Athens by that power, was, in the estimation of the Athenians, but a form of Laconism. That this is the sense in which the expression is used by Diogenes, appears further from an epigram of his own composition, quoted in the sequel of his text³, where Xenophon is described as having been banished “for the sake of his dear friend Cyrus.” To these direct testimonies that the Historian’s crime was his Persian campaign, may be added the warning in the *Anabasis*, addressed by Socrates to his pupil, as to the danger he might

¹ In Xenoph. § 51.² Hellen. iii. i. 5.³ § 58.

incur, were he to connect himself with Cyrus, of giving offence to his Athenian fellow-citizens, on the same ground stated by Pausanias, of the Persian prince's former zealous cooperation with Lacedæmon in the Peloponnesian war.

Modern
theory.

This unanimity of native testimony, ratified indirectly by Xenophon himself, may seem to preclude any mere speculative conjecture as to the question of fact on which it bears. Modern commentators have hence, for the most part, acquiesced in this view. It must however be admitted to offer intrinsic improbabilities of a nature to justify scepticism. It has accordingly been set aside by several eminent authors of our own day¹, who assume the Historian's crime to have been his having fought in the Spartan ranks against his own country at the battle of Coronea. His sentence, in this case, could not have been pronounced until five or six years after the date assigned by the antients. It has been further supposed, that during the intermediate period he had returned to Athens, had resided several years at his ease, and composed certain of his works, in that city.

His own
evidence.

This theory presents itself, on first view, in a favourable aspect. It places Xenophon's offence and punishment in a relation of cause and effect to each other, which is wanting or defective in the accredited account. It is certainly not easy to understand how his service under Cyrus, offensive as it might be to the feelings of his fellow-citizens, could have constituted a ground of criminal prosecution. His service under Agesilaus on the other hand was a crime, for

¹ Niebuhr, *Rheinisch. Mus.* 1827, p. 196.; *Kleine histor. Schriften*, p. 366.; and in the *Cambr. Philolog. Museum*, vol. I. p. 487.; Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, vol. IX. p. 19. 240. sqq.

which no penalties could be too severe. A plausible argument in favour of this opinion has also been derived from one of the passages, in which Xenophon, in the *Anabasis*, alludes to his exile.¹ The general tenor of those passages is, however, so clearly in favour of the old doctrine regarding the time of the banishment, as, combined with other testimonies, to establish to this extent its claim to a preference; and that preference, if conceded, necessarily involves, it need hardly be remarked, a rejection of the Coronæan theory regarding the cause.

While Xenophon, neither in the *Anabasis* nor any other of his works, distinctly alludes to the nature of his offence, unless indeed the account of his conversation with Socrates is to be considered in that light, he, in the former work, on several occasions, very clearly though indirectly defines the date of his exile, as shortly subsequent to the termination of his service with Seuthes. On the army engaging with Thimbron's commissioners, he describes himself as unwilling at first to retain his command, being, to use his own words, "bent on returning home, his sentence of banishment not having been yet pronounced at Athens." The obvious import of these words is, that although the sentence was not yet passed, and hence formed no obstacle to his return at the moment, it was passed so soon after as to interpose such an obstacle. The phrase above rendered "not yet," when used, as here, in a narrative of contemporaneous history, is invariably employed by Xenophon, as by other Greek authors, to indicate a brief interval, or immediate succession of events:

¹ See Appendix I.

and even admitting, in special cases, a certain latitude of signification, it cannot be supposed that it would ever have occurred to the Historian, in a detailed account of his daily and hourly thoughts, words, and actions, to qualify his prospect of success in an object which he was desirous of attempting forthwith, by reference to an obstacle which, as assumed in the Coronæan theory, did not occur for upwards of five years afterwards.

This text, it must also be observed, is but one of a number of others in the latter part of the *Anabasis*¹ declaratory of his intention or desire to quit the army, and return to Athens. Had his object been merely to remind his readers, in a general way, that his banishment, not having taken place until long afterwards, interposed no barrier to his return, it would have been more natural to make that intimation on one of the earlier occasions. But on none of these does he allude to any political obstacle. When therefore we suddenly, in this, the last passage of the series, find prominence given to such an obstacle, the natural inference must be, that something had transpired in the meantime to create alarm; that the blow, in fact, was now imminent, which, from one or two other previous allusions, he seems to have suspected was in preparation. When once prepared, it would hardly have remained suspended over his head for five or six years. The circumstance that this passage is the last in which he expresses a hope or intention of returning to Athens, is not without its significance. The silence henceforward maintained on the subject seems to indicate that all such hope was now extinguished. After

¹ vi. ii. 15.; vii. i. 4. 6. 8.; vi. 11. 33. sq.

having indulged in so many hypothetical allusions to an immediate resettlement at home, he would hardly, had such been his ultimate lot, have closed his narrative by leaving himself still a wandering adventurer on the coast of Asia.

On another occasion, shortly before his departure from Thrace, he intimates a sense of impending calamity. In the council of war, after the arrival of the Spartan commissioners, he complains to his men of their having, by their groundless aspersions, lost him the good will, not only of the Spartan authorities, but of Seuthes, "in whose favour he had hoped to find "a place of refuge, should necessity arise."¹ Why should Xenophon have looked forward to an asylum at the court of a Thracian prince, or anywhere else, unless in the capacity of a man deprived, or expecting to be deprived, of his natural home? And what could have suggested the thought of such an asylum in 399 B.C., if his sentence of exile was not passed until 394 B.C.?

13. This question is of importance in its bearings, not merely on the events of Xenophon's life, but on his moral character. If he was driven into banishment at the time stated by his native biographers, on account of some slight offence, or as the victim of some popular caprice; if during the first years of his banishment he remained true to his allegiance as a citizen; if he had used his best efforts to propitiate, as a dutiful son, the wrath even of an unreasonably offended mother; if, on the other hand, his judges, harsh or hasty in passing sentence, had proved inexorable in withholding pardon, Xenophon's ultimate renunciation of his Attic allegiance might be con-

Bearing of the question on his moral character.

¹ VII. vi. 34.

sidered, if not a justifiable, a comparatively venial offence. But if we suppose, as the Coronæan theory implies, that after resettling at Athens, and passing several years in that city, he had returned to Asia, and, on the outbreak of the war with Sparta, had deliberately entered the service and fought in the ranks of his country's enemy, he would have been guilty of an act of reckless treason, scarcely to be paralleled in the annals of political apostasy.

That the intermediate years, between his service under Seuthes and his service under Agesilaus, were spent in banishment, may be gathered from another passage of the *Anabasis*, describing the mode in which he disposed of the treasure intrusted to him at Cerasus for joint dedication to Apollo and Diana. With the allotment set apart for the god, he prepared and deposited in the Delphic sanctuary a votive offering, of what precise nature is not mentioned. He does not inform us what became of the part destined for Diana, during the first six years (400—394 B.C.) after it was consigned to his charge. But on setting out from Asia for Greece with Agesilaus, he left it, he tells us¹, in care of Megabyzus, the priest of the goddess at Ephesus, with instructions, that if he survived the dangers of the campaign, the money was to be restored to himself; if he perished, it was to be laid out in honour of the goddess, in such a manner as Megabyzus should deem fit. It was eventually restored to the Historian, after his final settlement in Peloponnesus about 392 B.C.; and the mode in which it was then expended, as described in a previous page, throws light, both on his original intention regarding it, and on the cause of the six

¹ v. iii. 7. sqq.

years' delay to carry that intention into effect. It may safely be assumed that Xenophon had from the first conceived the plan, the subsequent execution of which at Scillus he so graphically describes, of endowing, with Diana's share of the spoil, a sanctuary to herself, on the model of her favourite seat of worship, on his obtaining the requisite facilities for the purpose. The first of these requisites was a permanent domicile, either in his native Attica, or some other part of Greece congenial to his taste. Had he then, as assumed in the Coronæan theory, not only revisited Athens, but resided there at his ease during several years, he would hardly all this time have allowed his Artemisian treasure to lie idle in Asia. He would assuredly have brought it along with him; and his first thought, on reaching his Attic home, would have been, as it was on settling in his Peloponnesian home, to carry his pious project into effect.

From these and other data, solely or chiefly derived from the Historian's own text, we collect the following outline of his vicissitudes, in the interval between the close of the *Anabasis* and his connexion with Agesilaus. His sentence may probably have overtaken him about the time, as defined by Diogenes, when he made over the Cyreian troops to Thimbron (B.C. 399). It does not distinctly appear that he continued either to command or serve with those troops. But the intimate knowledge which he shows in the *Hellenica*¹ of the field operations, both of the Spartan generals and the Persian satraps, and the details which he gives of their personal affairs, imply that from time to time, at least, he accompanied the

His Spartan connexions.

¹ B. III.

With
Agésilæus
at Coronea.

Spartan army and enjoyed the confidence of its commanders. One of his first cares would be, when master of sufficient leisure, to transmit his offering to Delphi. This he may possibly have done in person; for the sentence of exile from Athens would be no bar to his visiting other parts of Greece. He could hardly have wanted either means or inclination to visit Sparta; and may probably have formed his first acquaintance with Agésilæus in that city, and accompanied him to Asia. Close as was his connexion with Agésilæus, he nowhere alludes to his having held any actual appointment under him. He mentions his own presence at the battle of Coronea (B.C. 394), and the Cyreian troops as forming part of the Lacedæmonian army; but does not intimate in what capacity he himself took part in the action.¹ His apologists have indeed attempted to interpret his notice on the subject as indicating his presence only, not his participation in the combat; that he was not therefore actually guilty of bearing arms against his country. This however is a more charitable than critical view of his case. His own statement is, that "when about to share with Agésilæus the dangers of the Coronæan campaign, he charged Megabyzus, if he should survive, to replace the money in his hands, but, should he be a sufferer," &c.² This is not the language of a man who attended Agésilæus in the mere quality of travelling companion, or who in his encounters with the enemy was satisfied with the part of looker-on. A warrior who had borne the brunt of many bloody actions, in the most arduous military enterprise of the age, could hardly

¹ Hellen. iv. iii.

² Anab. v. iii. 6.

have characterised so harmless a species of campaigning as facing danger and death in the battle-field.

14. Attention has above been directed to the disproportion between the offence for which, in the accredited accounts, the Historian suffered, and the punishment inflicted. If we admit, and it seems difficult to escape the powerful array of testimony to the fact, that his campaign with Cyrus was the sole cause of his exile, it would follow that the Attic democracy was here guilty of an act, nearly on a level in absurdity, if not in ferocity, with their treatment of Socrates, Phidias, and other illustrious victims of their caprice. It was natural that Athens should take umbrage at the entry of one of her citizens into the service of a prince, who had proved himself a bitter enemy to her interests. Such conduct might even have not unreasonably formed a ground of criminal penalties, so long as the offence of Cyrus, a complicity with which it seemed indirectly to involve, was still fresh in men's memories, and the circumstances under which that offence was committed had undergone no material alteration. But if the length of time that had elapsed, and the subsequent political changes, are taken into account, it becomes less easy to understand how such old resentments could have been so carefully treasured up, or should have burst forth so long afterwards in so exaggerated a form. At the time when Cyrus was the ally of Sparta, Sparta and Athens were declared enemies of each other. But for several years prior to Xenophon's engagement with Cyrus, Athens and Sparta were allies; and since the friendly cooperation of king Pausanias with Thrasybulus in restoring the democracy, this alliance had, ostensibly at least, been cordial; but Cyrus had never been the

Harshness
of his sen-
tence.

enemy of Athens unless as the friend of Lacedæmon. From the time when war ceased between the two republics he had been guilty of no hostile act against Athens, and was now, as the friend of her own ally Sparta, entitled to look for indulgence, if not support, in an enterprise carried on with Sparta's sanction and aid.¹ Her condemnation of Xenophon for serving Cyrus in a cause promoted by Sparta, thus became an indirect insult to the Spartans, whom it was far from her interest at that time to offend. It is difficult therefore to understand how, on such grounds alone, an Athenian citizen could have been visited with extreme penalties, for having, in company, be it remembered, with some thirteen thousand of his fellow-Greeks, availed himself of their now recognised privilege to seek their fortunes in foreign adventure; at a time of profound tranquillity at home, when there was no risk of their being led by such engagements to act against their own government or its allies. Nor must it be forgotten, that there were numerous other Athenians besides Xenophon in the Cyreian army. In the *Anabasis*² no fewer than eight are mentioned by name, most of them officers of a certain rank, or warriors remarkable for valour; and for every one so mentioned it may be presumed that there were many of inferior distinction in the camp. Was the punishment inflicted on Xenophon common to all his fellow-countrymen who served under Cyrus, or was it an honour exclusively bestowed on himself?

The singularity of the case appears the greater, when we reflect, that the enterprise imputed to Xenophon as a crime, was universally regarded as one

¹ Hellen. III. i. 1.; Anab. I. ii. 21.

² II. i. 12., III. iii. 20., IV. ii. 13., V. vi. 14., VI. v. 11., VII. iii. 28., vi. 41.

of the most glorious in the military annals of his nation; and that, if we may trust his own account, the largest share of that glory accrued to himself, and through him to Athens. That he remained, nearly to its close, under the impression that it would prove to him a source of distinction rather than disgrace, appears from the motive which inclined him to accept the chief command of the army, when offered to him at Harmenë: "that the proposed honour was "not only great in itself, but would render his name "illustrious in his native republic."¹

Add to all this, that the Lacedæmonians were now themselves commencing hostilities against the Persian king. On this account they had sent commissioners to Thrace, to enlist Xenophon and his Cyreians; and Athens had also furnished her quota of troops for the same service. Three hundred Athenian cavalry, as the Historian informs² us in his Hellenica, were on their way to the camp of Thimbron, there to join the Cyreians, who were on their way thither from Thrace under the command of Xenophon. It was thus not unlikely that, on the two Athenian commanders meeting at head-quarters, the one might find that he was the bearer of a sentence of banishment against the other, for his past services in a cause in which both were now engaged.

Whatever weight may attach to these difficulties, it is not easy to evade the unanimous testimony of antiquity to the fact, that in one mode or other Xenophon's service with the Ten thousand was the cause of his exile. The gravest authority on the subject is that of Socrates, or rather of Socrates and Xenophon conjointly. The philosopher's dread lest

¹ VI. i. 20., VII. vi. 33.

² Hellen. III. i. 4.

his pupil's connexion with the Persian prince should be imputed as a fault by the Athenians, even if not to be taken as strictly prophetic, implies at least that the subsequent proceedings, strange as they may appear to us, were nothing wonderful in the eyes of Socrates, who knew his countrymen too well to be widely mistaken, either as to their feelings or conduct, in a case of this description.

His character, literary genius, and habits of life.

15. We shall conclude this biographical memoir with a sketch of Xenophon's character, as a man and a writer, to be further illustrated by the ensuing examination of his works.

The celebrity of Xenophon is derived from three sources; his eminence as a historian, as a miscellaneous essayist, and as a military commander. It is to the aggregate of his merit in these three capacities, rather than to his excellence in any one of them, that he owes his prominent place in the list of Greek illustrious men. His productions in the several branches of literature which he cultivated, however pleasing and elegant, cannot take rank among the nobler models of Greek prose composition. As a soldier he deservedly enjoys a brilliant reputation, in the peculiar kind of warfare in which he is known to have been actively engaged. But it was one affording little opportunity for the highest exercise of strategic talent. His campaigns, however ably conducted, were, in so far as known to fame, fought against barbarous enemies. There is no record of his having ever held the responsible command of a large body of regular troops, against equally well trained and appointed adversaries.

His intellectual powers were more remarkable for variety than solidity or depth. In literary under-

takings of a popular and familiar order, in his Autobiography, as in his treatises on Hunting, Horsemanship, and Domestic economy, he appears master of his subject. In others demanding a higher range of mental effort, in historical research or philosophical combination, he is meagre or superficial. He wanted, both as a man of the world and a man of letters, that important, if not indispensable basis of greatness, the devotion of a life to one principal object or steady course of occupation. This forms a broad feature of difference between his character as a Historian, and that of his two distinguished predecessors. Thucydides, in several parts of his text informs us, that the composition of his history had been the main object of his existence; and Herodotus, if he does not so plainly state, intimates no less plainly, by the internal evidence of his great work, that his chief ambition was its completion and success. All that we know of Xenophon implies that he never had in view, much less steadily pursued, any such definite purpose in life. As frequently happens with those who possess talent for so many things, he had no decided taste for any single one, sufficient to constitute it a profession or permanent pursuit. The first half of his manhood seems to have been spent in cultivating letters, or in his favourite manly exercises. When however an opening occurred for gratifying his love of novelty, and bettering his lot, he became a political adventurer. When forced to become a soldier, he also became a successful military commander. That active military duty was little to his taste appears, as well from his account of how he was led to embark on it, as from the anxiety he shows, the moment the step could be taken with propriety, to be released from the command

of a noble army, whose confidence he enjoyed, and which he had often led to victory.

Although political science was one of Xenophon's favourite subjects of speculative study, he had evidently still less turn for active political life than for military service. His Autobiography contains no hint of his ever having aspired to distinction as a statesman in his native republic; yet his birth and connexion must have supplied, in those eventful times, favourable openings for such a career to a man of his ability. The only notice with which he favours us of his early life, the account of his friendship with Proxenus, described by himself as a person of unsettled habits, indicates in this respect a congeniality of character between the two. The remark in the *Anabasis*, that "service under Cyrus was likely to prove more profitable than any to be looked for in his own country," though placed in the mouth of Proxenus, equally expresses, no doubt, Xenophon's own feelings. His connexion with Cyrus, which has above been treated as political rather than military, was in truth, strictly speaking, as little the one as the other. The functions of a purely professional politician would have been as unpalatable to him at the court of an Oriental prince, as in the Pnyx of Athens. But foreign adventure, under such patronage, held out to a man of his tastes attractions which were wanting at home. Another apparent exception, which tends still more to confirm the view here taken, is his scheme of founding a colony on the Euxine coast, with the remains of the Cyreian army. This would have been no doubt a political enterprise, in the strictest sense of the term; but it was one precisely of that speculative nature adapted to the taste of Xenophon, replete with novelty and varied sources of

excitement, and offering a fine field for reducing to experiment those theories of civil government, with which he had been familiarised in the schools of Athens.

The knowledge which we possess of the latter half of his life, after his settlement in Peloponnesus, indicates a similar want of personal concern in state affairs either at home or abroad; although his writings show him to have been a careful observer of the complications of Greek federal policy during that period.

Another indirect proof of his distaste for active political life, is his apparent freedom from party spirit, in the familiar sense of the phrase. Much as he was swayed by personal feelings, in his judgements on individual men, events, or interests, his writings indicate no actual preference for any one of those forms of government, a zeal for or against which so fiercely agitated the minds of his contemporaries. Here, as in other respects, he appears to act under local or incidental impressions. While some passages of his works might stamp him as an admirer of aristocracy, oligarchy, or even pure despotism, others might entitle the friends of democracy to claim him with equal right as an advocate of their views.

Xenophon's moral qualities are on the same moderate scale as his intellectual powers. His defects may rather be designated mental infirmities than vices; his merits rather amiable qualities than virtues. His impulses, (of passion there is no appearance of his having been susceptible,) were habitually good and generous, but liable to be supplanted by any strong countervailing motive or temptation. Caution must always be exercised in judging a man by his account of himself; and our knowledge of Xenophon is all but exclusively derived from his own writings, chiefly

from the *Anabasis*. In this work, essentially an autobiography of the most eventful part of his life, the preponderance of favourable matter is overwhelming. By far the greater part of its contents is devoted to his own meritorious performances. It would have required however a greater degree of studied artifice than there is reason to believe Xenophon has employed, or was capable of employing, as a witness in his own case, to falsify or seriously disguise the more prominent traits of his character. His portrait therefore of himself in the *Anabasis*, making due allowance for the self-esteem of the artist, may be taken as in the main a correct, though favourable, resemblance. He there appears as the accomplished scholar, soldier, and citizen of the world; as a man of great personal courage, energy, and presence of mind; of a fine temper, humane and kind-hearted; patient under injury and obloquy, where sufferance was required for his own credit or the interest of the cause in which he was engaged; disinterested in regard to money, and other worldly objects of like inferior order; in his ordinary intercourse with men, sensitive on the point of honour, to a keen spirit of self-vindication where he thought himself in the right, or wished to appear so; but in greater matters, where his personal interests or feelings were brought strongly into play, his sense of the distinction between right and wrong, and his respect for public opinion, were equally liable to be extinguished or obscured.

His partiality as a historian.

16. The two main defects of Xenophon are, his want of truthfulness as a man, and his want of patriotism as a citizen. The former of these failings is chiefly displayed in his capacity of author. As a historian he is notorious for a partiality the most

unscrupulous, fortunately also the most transparent, that has ever probably been exemplified in the page of any writer, otherwise moderately endowed with tact and judgement in the art of composition. He seems however rarely to have carried this defect the length of deliberate misstatement of fact. His method of falsification consists in suppressing, colouring, or otherwise misrepresenting truth; in giving special prominence to transactions honourable to the cause which he favours; in concealing or palliating those of an opposite tendency; and in a corresponding degree omitting what is creditable, dwelling on what is disparaging, or harshly construing what is indifferent, in the conduct or motives of the opposite party. This defect in his art of composition is in harmony with his general character. The writing of history was with him, like other pursuits, not so much a business or duty, performed under a sense of responsibility, as a personal gratification. He views men and events under the aspect most congenial to his own feelings. Hence, in the same cause where the defect originates may be sought the apology; in the natural amiability of his nature, which led him, careless of better considerations, to do honour to those whom he admired, or to whom he felt bound by ties of gratitude. In the zeal of his favour to his friends, there is also little display of actual rancour towards enemies. His ill-will manifests itself rather in sullen silence than in bitter expressions. Like a sulky child or a pouting woman, he will not so much as mention the objects of his dislike. Hence even the names of some of the greatest men of his age scarcely occur in his text; while others of inferior note are harped on to excess. This peculiarly "subjective" tendency

of his research is no less manifest in the choice than the treatment of his subjects. He not only garbles those which he selects, but, in the *Hellenica* for example, a work professing to be a general history of Greece, he omits whole periods or masses of events, where not capable of such treatment, or which, from whatever cause, he does not care to honour with his attention; while others, comparatively unimportant, are discussed with a detail worthy of momentous national vicissitudes.

How far this defective veracity, so largely exemplified in the affairs of others, may have extended to his own, our all but exclusive dependence on himself for our knowledge of the latter renders it difficult to judge. It is however reasonable to assume, that a man whose tenderness for the honour of his friends led him to such modes of upholding it, would be apt to represent his own conduct in a like indulgent manner; and, as will be seen hereafter, his autobiography is not wanting in internal evidence that such was the case.

His defective patriotism.

Xenophon's treason to his native republic forms a dark spot on his character, which neither the lustre of his amiable qualities, nor the casuistry of his blind apologists, can disguise or efface. For a man to co-operate, for any cause or in any mode, with a foreign enemy against his own country, is a base action; to appear in arms against his fellow-citizens, and be directly instrumental to shedding their blood, is a monstrous crime. In this, as in other forms of iniquity, there are, it is true, degrees of criminality; and Xenophon has, in these pages, already been absolved from the graver charge of having fought against Athens without even the pretext of previous provo-

cation. He has enough to answer for in the step as it was taken, without any unattested aggravation of its guilt. When a man of strong passions and aspiring ambition, zealous from his youth in the service of his country, has been, or believes himself to have been, unjustly and contumeliously treated by her in return, allowance may be made for the impulse which leads a proud spirit to retaliate, when to submit in patience would be the more honourable course. And if the measures of retaliation are limited to purely political action, and resorted to by the offender more with a view to the restoration of his civic rights, and resumption of his previous course of patriotic service, than of damaging his country's interests, the grounds of palliation are greatly enlarged. The case here assumed is that of Alcibiades, as described jointly by Thucydides and by Xenophon himself, and commonly considered as one of the worst on record. Yet no such palliating circumstances can be alleged in the case of Xenophon. His treatment may have been harsh. Harshness was the common mode in Athens, as in most other Greek states, of dealing with offending citizens. But there is no ground for imputing ingratitude. No trace exists of Xenophon ever having deserved well of his native republic. His first recorded step in active life was a deliberate alienation of his services, in favour of a foreign potentate who had recently proved himself her bitter enemy. His indirect description of the objects of ambition which she held out to a man of adventurous spirit, as worthless in comparison with those which attracted him to his new patron, betrays a contemptuous indifference to her interests as well as her good opinion; while the easy tone in which he

incidentally alludes both to his banishment, and his subsequent traitorous connexion with Sparta and service in her army at Coronea, indicate neither regret nor shame for his change of position.

There is further curious evidence of the laxness of Xenophon's civic morality, in the pains which he takes to palliate his guilt, by placing in a favourable light the more distinguished political apostates of his own times, and even by representing, in his fictitious narratives, treachery and disloyalty as honourable traits of character. The origin of Xenophon's celebrity in the world was his attachment to the cause of a traitor; and the first two books of the *Anabasis* are a practical vindication of an unnatural act of treason. In the chapter of the *Hellenica*¹ describing the return of Alcibiades to Athens, where the several shades of public opinion regarding the past life and character of that statesman are given, in the words alternately of his adherents and his adversaries, a detailed defence has been placed in the mouth of the former, while the argument of the latter is summed up in one or two brief sentences. The plot of Xenophon's political romance, the *Cyropædia*, hinges mainly on the defection of subjects from their lawful sovereign; and most of the heroes of the tale, to whose characters an attempt is made to impart romantic interest, are distinguished for zeal in the cause of their country's conqueror.

His religious belief.

17. The religious belief of Xenophon in the existence, power, and providence of the pagan deities, is as full and confiding as that of Herodotus. His polytheistic orthodoxy is perhaps still more complete than that of the Halicarnassian. The latter habi-

¹ I. iv. 12. sqq.

tually introduces God in the abstract, the unity of the deity, rather than any god in particular, as the supreme dispenser of destiny. Xenophon more scrupulously attributes the divine functions to his own favourite objects of worship; especially Jupiter the King, Apollo, and Diana. He was not only a devout believer in the arts of divination, but himself a skilful practitioner. His faith in the efficacy of sacrifice, in its attendant rite of aruspicy, and in omens, dreams, and prodigies, is carried to an excess unexampled in the case of any other Greek mind of equal acuteness, and to which so many sources of enlightenment were accessible. Several characteristic turns in the narrative of the *Anabasis* hinge on the pious casuistry with which he endeavours, at all costs, to make out the infallibility of divine manifestations of momentous import, but which even his own account of the result represents as signally at fault.

It is remarkable, that with this rigid orthodoxy of religious faith and worship in the proper sense, Xenophon appears free from credulity in regard to those preternatural events or phenomena, with which Herodotus was so fond of seasoning his narrative. There is, to his credit be it said, no Greek historian, who shows less respect for the purely marvellous, as distinct from the religious element of Greek mythology. He thus presents a singular, perhaps a solitary instance, of the most undoubting pagan piety, unaccompanied by superstition in any other form. That something may here be due to the influence of Thucydides on his continuator and admirer, may reasonably be assumed; and becomes the more probable from the coincidence, that Xenophon's contemporary Philistus, the undisguised imitator of

Thucydides, appears also to have participated in this honourable spirit of rationalism. The other leading historians of the period, Ctesias, Theopompus, Ephorus, and Callisthenes, are all more or less prone to indulge in the same trivial vein of mythological speculation, which runs through the productions of the Herodoti, Hellanici, and Hecatæi of the preceding century.

His philosophy.

In the allusions to Xenophon's literary character, he is perhaps as frequently honoured with the title of "Philosopher" as with that of "Historian." His pretensions to the former are however feeble, and have been omitted in our catalogue of his sources of celebrity. He is not the author of any properly philosophical work; and the doctrines interspersed in his miscellaneous writings are little remarkable for novelty or depth. His philosophy, if such it can be called, is, like his style, simple and familiar; consisting in a pleasing mode of shaping popular views, rather than attempts at original theory.

Of Xenophon's relations as a husband or a father, we possess no authentic knowledge, beyond the fact of his having had several sons. The general tone of his allusions to social intercourse, while far from warranting any suspicion of profligate habits, indicates at least an indulgent feeling towards those peculiarities of sexual relation, which formed the weak point of the Socratic school of morality.

His literary style.

The style of Xenophon has been defined by the ancient critics as "meagre" or "slender,"¹ in its contrast with the dignity or brilliancy of the "lofty," and the "middle" or "medium" styles. The two former

¹ *ἰσχνός, ἀφελής*. Marcellin. Vit. Thuc. 40. Dionys. Halic. passim; Hermogenes de Form. Orat. II. p. 396. sq. ed. Porti.

epithets apply with some justice to the matter, but convey to modern ears hardly a fair estimate of the manner of his composition. His style indeed, in the proper sense, has been universally and justly admired¹ for graces of no ordinary character ; for an easy, elegant simplicity, and harmonious flow of expression ; for perspicuity of sense, and purity of Attic idiom. These however are pleasing and attractive, rather than striking or brilliant, qualities. Xenophon's art of composition, like his genius at large, may be not inappropriately defined as the perfection of mediocrity. The classical prose literature offers no near parallel to it. The nearest is perhaps to be found in the Works and Days of Hesiod. Like Hesiod, Xenophon, in his own simple manner, is not devoid of dignity ; and as he seldom attempts to rise higher, he is the less liable to run into exaggeration. His simplicity more frequently dwindles, especially in dialogue, into over-familiarity or conversational gossip. His genius was in all its developments more of the practical than the imaginative order. He is consequently more successful in history than in fiction. His accounts of real events which he himself witnessed, are often highly graphic. But his efforts to produce effect in fictitious narrative are apt to be constrained and tediously circumstantial. Poverty of invention and barrenness of incident are hence characteristic defects of his great work of fiction, the *Cyropædia*. He rarely indulges in figures of speech, poetical or rhetorical ; and his efforts in either department are as rarely successful. The poetical terms and idioms, on the

¹ Cicero, *Orator*, 9. 19. ; Quintil. x. i. 33. 82. ; Dionys. Hal. *De Præcip. Histor.* 4. ; De Vett. *Script.* III. 2. ; *Ars rhetor.* II. 9. ; Diog. Laert. § 57. ; Suid. in *Xenoph.*

other hand, of which he freely avails himself, are commonly so well chosen, and introduced in so easy and natural a manner, as to savour neither of affectation, nor uncongeniality with the general tone of his Attic prose. His attempts to embellish his own pages by citations from other popular authors are limited chiefly to his miscellaneous treatises¹, and evince, it need scarcely be remarked, an extensive acquaintance with the national literature.

Xenophon's Speeches are generally, like his narrative text, simple, perspicuous, and to the point.² Without pretensions to the logical acuteness or rhetorical power of Thucydides, they are free from his antithetical subtlety and elaborate dialectics. Some of them are among the best specimens of their author's composition, well adapted in substance and expression to the character of the speakers, and distinguished at times by much ethic and dramatic spirit. The fault into which they are most apt to run is diffuseness ; a fault here, as in other cases, chiefly observable where his personal or political sympathies are most warmly enlisted, especially in his self-defensive orations in the *Anabasis*.

Although a man of acute intellect, and possessing extensive knowledge of human character, Xenophon does not seem to have been endowed with any fine sense of comic humour. His own attempts at wit are not happy ; and the good things which he places in the mouths of his actors are seldom remarkable for

¹ *Memor.* i. ii. 20. 56. sqq., iii. 3. 7., ii. i. 20, 21., iv. ii. 33.; *Apol. Soc.* § 26.; *Sympos.* ii. 4. 26., iii. 6., viii. 30. sq.; *De Re Equ.* i. 1.; *De Venat.* i. 1. sqq.; *Anab.* v. i. 2., i. viii. 26.; *Cyrop.* ii. ii. 24.; *Schneid. ad loc.*; viii. v. 28.

² *Dio. Chrysost. Orat.* xviii. p. 480. ed. Reiske.

point or elegance, often puerile or grossly indelicate.

Xenophon's collective works, as extant in the time of Diogenes Laertius and enumerated by that biographer, are the same as those which we now possess. They are further described by him¹ as comprising nearly forty "books." This description also applies to those in the present collection, the titles of which are here subjoined : His works.

Hellenica; Anabasis; Cyropædia; the Polity of Lacedæmon; the Polity of Athens; Hiero; On the Athenian revenues; Agesilaus; Memorabilia of Socrates; Apology of Socrates; The Symposium, or Banquet; On Domestic economy; On the Equestrian art; the Hipparchicus; On Hunting.

If, as was customary with the antients, each of the received divisions of the larger works is taken as a separate "book," and the number of the smaller tracts is added, the whole amount to thirty-seven.²

The order in which the works have here been arranged is that in which we propose to examine them. The first three, strictly narrative compositions, de-

¹ In Xen. § 56. sqq.

² Other works ascribed to Xenophon are Lives of the Philosophers (Suid. in Xenophon: cf. Diog. Laert. in Vit. 48.); and nine epistles, four preserved by Stobæus, and five (from the Vatican library) published by Leo Allatius in his collection of Socratic epistles (Paris, 1635). The first four letters are printed in Thieme's edition of Xenophon, vol. iv.; the whole nine in Weiske's edition, vol. vi.

In the text of Jul. Poll. Onom. (vi. xxxiii. 143.), where mention is made of a Treatise on Truth, and of one on the Art of Rhetoric, the name Antiphon (as written in several MSS.) ought probably to be substituted for that of Xenophon.

Concerning some citations by antient grammarians, from Xenophon, of passages not now to be found in his works, see Krüger, Hist. Philol. Studien, pt. ii. p. 95.

serve precedence from their bulk, and as the standard productions of their author. The ensuing four treat of political questions immediately connected with Xenophon's own time. Then follow three biographical essays; the first in honour of the leading person who figures on Xenophon's historical page; the others in honour of the most distinguished contemporary sage, Xenophon's revered friend and preceptor. The two following tracts contain supplementary illustrations of the habits and doctrines of that sage. The remaining three, On Horsemanship, Cavalry service, and the Chase, are equally illustrative of Xenophon's own habits and pursuits.

The part of the collection which alone properly belongs to this branch of our subject, are the three Historical narratives. It has however, for reasons explained in the introduction to this volume, been considered desirable, in connecting our notices in chief of authors remarkable for the variety of their productions, with that order of composition from which they mainly derive their celebrity, to extend our critical commentary to their essays in other departments. Nor would it be easy to name a writer, an acquaintance with whose entire compositions is more indispensable to a right estimate of his own genius.

CHAP. XII.

XENOPHON: THE HELLENICA.

1. EPITOME OF THE TEXT.—2. PLAN, COMPOSITION, AND MATERIALS. TRIPARTITE ARRANGEMENT OF THE SUBJECT.—3. ATTIC HISTORY. LACEDÆMONIAN HISTORY. HELLENIC HISTORY. XENOPHON'S PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF EVENTS.—4. HIS SPARTAN PARTIALITIES. HIS THEBAN ANTIPATHIES. STATE OF GREECE. SPARTA. THEBES AND ATHENS. LYSANDER AND AGESILAUS.—5. PELOPIDAS AND EPAMINONDAS. XENOPHON'S THEBAN HISTORY. CONTRAST OF HIS SPARTAN HISTORY.—6. BATTLE OF CORINTH; OF CORONEA; OF LEUCTRA.—7. INVASION OF LACONIA. REESTABLISHMENT OF MESSENIA. ORIGIN OF THE SPARTO-THEBAN WAR. SPHODRIAS. THESSALIAN AFFAIRS. HELOTS AFTER LEUCTRA. DESTRUCTION OF MANTINEA.—8. AGESILAÏSM OF XENOPHON. CORONEA. DEATH OF AGESIPOLIS. SEIZURE OF THE CADMÆA. PHILIUS. ATTEMPT ON THE PIRÆUS. DILEMMA OF XENOPHON.—9. AGESILAUS AND EPAMINONDAS. ATHENIAN AFFAIRS. IPHICRATES. THRASYBULUS. CONON. DELINEATION OF CHARACTER. STYLE IN THE NARROWER SENSE. DIALOGUE.—10. SPEECHES. DESCRIPTIONS. SPECULATIVE REMARKS. CHRONOLOGY OF THE HELLENICA. TIME AND MODE OF ITS COMPOSITION.

Book I. 411—405 B.C.

1. THE battle of Cynossema is followed by other engagements between the Spartan and Athenian fleets, chiefly to the advantage of the Athenians under the command of Alcibiades. In the action fought at Cyzicus, Mindarus the Spartan admiral is slain.¹ Epitome of the text.

In the twenty-second and twenty-third years of the war fortune continues to favour the Athenians, who reduce Byzantium and other neighbouring towns.²

In the twenty-fourth year of the war Cyrus, son of the Persian king Darius, appointed satrap-in-chief of Western Asia, largely subsidises the Lacedæmonians. Alcibiades visits Athens for the first time since his exile. He is honourably received, and returns to the seat of war with unlimited powers, and reinforcements of

¹ i.² ii.—iii.

men and ships. During his temporary absence from the main body of his fleet, to inspect a detachment stationed at Phocæa, his lieutenant Antiochus, in disobedience of his orders, engages the Peloponnesian force under Lysander at Notium, and is defeated. The Athenians lay this disaster to the charge of Alcibiades; who is again degraded from his command, and retires to the neighbouring district of Thrace. Conon and nine other generals are appointed in his stead.¹

In the twenty-fifth year of the war Callicratidas, succeeding Lysander in the command of the Peloponnesians, defeats Conon in an action near Mitylene, and blockades the Athenian fleet in the harbour of that city.² In the ensuing twenty-sixth³ year of the war he is himself vanquished and slain in the great battle of Arginusæ.

The Athenian admirals are accused before the Council, of neglecting the requisite measures for preserving the seamen drifting among the wrecks after the action. Upon this charge six of the accused, chiefly at the instance of Theramenes, one of their own officers, are condemned and suffer death.⁴

BOOK II. 405—403 B.C.

In the twenty-seventh year of the war (405—404) Lysander, restored to the command of the Peloponnesian force, again turns the tide of success in favour of Sparta. Alcibiades warns the Athenian admirals of the danger to which they were exposed by their incautious tactics. Neglecting his advice, they are surprised and defeated in the decisive battle of Ægospotami. Their whole fleet is taken and destroyed, and the native Athenian prisoners are put to death.⁵

Athens, deserted by her allies, Samos alone excepted, is invested by the Peloponnesian land force under Agis, and by the fleet of Lysander. After several months' siege, she is reduced by famine to surrender on humiliating terms. Her walls are destroyed, and the local government is placed under an executive body of Thirty,

¹ iv.—v.

² vi. 1—18.

³ vi. 18. sqq. There can be no reasonable doubt that the events here described belong, as is generally agreed by modern chronologists, to the twenty-sixth year of the war; and that the text of Xenophon (ii. i. 7.), in which they are assigned to the twenty-fifth, is an error either of the Historian or his transcribers. See Dodwell, *Chronol. Xenoph. ad loc.*

⁴ vii.

⁵ i.

with a great council of 3000 citizens in the Lacedæmonian interest.¹

Samos is reduced by Lysander, twenty-eight years and six months after the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war.²

The sanguinary policy of the Thirty, guided by Critias, who acquires the chief sway in their councils, is opposed by Theramenes, one of their own body; who, failing in his efforts to introduce more moderate measures, is, at the instance of Critias, himself put to death.³

Thrasybulus, one of the Athenian admirals defeated at Ægospotami, occupies with a small body of patriots the frontier Attic fortress of Phylæ. By a series of spirited stratagems he obtains possession of the Piræus, and routs the Thirty, in a battle in which Critias is slain. The Thirty are deposed by the council of 3000, and retire to Eleusis; a new executive body of Ten being elected in their stead. Lysander hastens with a Lacedæmonian force to support the oligarchal party. His policy is counteracted by the Spartan king Pausanias, who, jealous of Lysander's influence, himself takes the command of the Lacedæmonian force. After a few skirmishes with Thrasybulus, he arranges terms of accommodation between the contending parties in the city, who amicably agree on their future form of republican government. A counter-movement of the Thirty at Eleusis is suppressed, and its leaders are slain.⁴

BOOK III. 401—395 B.C.

The Lacedæmonians aid Cyrus in his revolt against his brother Artaxerxes. After its unsuccessful issue, they make war on the Persian satraps Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus; ostensibly on behalf of the Hellenic States in Asia Minor, whose rights of self-government, under Spartan protection, are, through the able management of the Spartiate general Dercyllidas, secured by treaty against Persian encroachment.⁵

A Lacedæmonian force, invading Elis, exacts redress from that republic for alleged acts of hostility against Sparta. The Elean territory is ravaged, and the offenders purchase peace by the cession of several frontier towns.⁶

Agis, king of Sparta, dies, and is succeeded by Agesilaus. A conspiracy formed by Cinadon, a Lacedæmonian citizen of se-

¹ ii. iii. 1—18.

² iii. 6. sq.

³ iii. 15. sqq.

⁴ iv.

⁵ i. ii. 1—20.

⁶ ii. 21. sqq.

condary order, for the overthrow of the government, is suppressed by the Ephori.¹

Renewed warlike preparations by Persia induce Agesilaus to conduct a force into Asia. He defeats the army of Tissaphernes, and by a skilful line of policy extends the Lacedæmonian interest in that country. Tissaphernes is deposed and put to death by Artaxerxes.²

Tithraustes, successor to his satrapy, by the distribution of money among leading citizens of Thebes, Corinth, and Argos, induces those republics to engage in a hostile league against Sparta. The Athenians have no share in the Persian gold, but from patriotic motives join the alliance. A Spartan force invades Bœotia in two divisions; one under Lysander, the other under king Pausanias. Lysander is defeated by the Thebans, and himself slain at Haliartus; Pausanias effects his retreat on humiliating terms. On reaching home he is degraded from his royal office and condemned to death, but escapes the execution of his sentence by flight to Tegea.³

BOOK IV. 395—388 B.C.

Agesilaus is recalled from Asia to attend to the Lacedæmonian interests in Greece.⁴ On his way home, by forced marches through Thessaly, he hears that Aristodemus, guardian of his young colleague Agesipolis (successor of Pausanias), had been victorious over the hostile confederacy in an action near Corinth,⁵ and that the Peloponnesian fleet under Pisander had shortly before been vanquished and dispersed at Cnidus, by the joint naval forces of Athens and Persia under Conon.⁶ Crossing into Bœotia, he defeats the allies at Coronea.⁷ The operations of the war are then concentrated around Corinth, where a strong party espouses the cause of Sparta.⁸ Success continues to attend her arms, under the able guidance of Agesilaus. His career of prosperity is checked by the Athenian generals Iphicrates and Callias, who cut off and destroy a large body of the best Spartan troops near Sicyon.⁹

Agesilaus crosses into Northern Greece, to support the friendly State of Calydon against the aggressions of the Acarnanians, who, after an obstinate resistance, are reduced to submission. Agesipolis makes an abortive incursion into the Argive territory.¹⁰

¹ iii.² iv.³ v.⁴ i. ii. 1. sqq.⁵ ii. 9. sqq.⁶ iii. 10. sq.⁷ iii. 15. sqq.⁸ iv.⁹ v. 7. sqq.¹⁰ vi. vii.

After the battle of Cnidus, Conon and Pharnabazus, with the combined Athenian and Persian fleets, obtain the mastery of the sea, and ravage the coasts of the hostile States of Peloponnesus. Conon, aided by funds from the Persian king, restores the walls of Athens, destroyed by Lysander.¹

The Lacedæmonians dispatch Antalcidas, with overtures for a general peace under the mediation of Artaxerxes, to the satrap Tiribazus (successor of Tithraustes). Their proposals are favourably received by that officer, but discountenanced by other advisers of the Persian king; and desultory war continues on the Asiatic coasts. In an action fought in the isle of Lesbos, between the Lacedæmonians under Therimachus, and an Athenian land force under Thrasybulus, the Spartan commander is defeated and slain. Thrasybulus is soon after assassinated at Aspendus, by the native peasantry, in revenge for acts of violence committed by his troops. In a subsequent engagement between Anaxibius, successor in command to Therimachus, and Iphicrates successor to Thrasybulus, the Spartan is again, by the superior tactics of his adversary, surprised, defeated with heavy loss, and himself slain.²

BOOK V. 388—375 B.C.

Hostilities are carried on between the Spartan and Athenian sea and land forces on the coasts of Ægina and Attica, chiefly to the advantage of the Spartans. Teleutias, with a Peloponnesian squadron, entering the Piræus, captures or damages a number of Athenian vessels. Antalcidas, about the same time, with a powerful fleet, restores the naval superiority of Sparta on the Asiatic coast.³

Under the auspices of Artaxerxes, peace is concluded on the terms formerly proposed by Antalcidas. Of these the more important were, that the privilege of independent government should be restored to the whole body of Hellenic states, except those of continental Asia, which pass under the sovereignty of Persia, and the islands of Lemnos, Scyros, and Imbros, which revert to their former dependence on Athens.⁴

After the ratification of this treaty, the Lacedæmonians, on former grounds of offence against the Mantineans, summon them to dismantle their city of its walls. On their refusal, king Agesipolis invades the Mantinean territory, and destroys both walls and

¹ viii. 1—11.

² viii. 12. sqq.

³ i. 1—29.

⁴ i. 29. sqq.

city, which the inhabitants bind themselves not to rebuild, but to reside in scattered villages in the open country. In the State of Phlius the supremacy of Sparta is also established, by a forced restoration of her exiled partisans to their political rights.¹

Envoys arrive at Lacedæmon from the Greek colonies of Acanthus and Apollonia in Thrace, craving protection against the neighbour State of Olynthus, whose ambitious designs they describe as dangerous to the Lacedæmonian interest in the north. A force is accordingly dispatched to Thrace, in two divisions, the first under the command of Eudamidas, the second under that of Phœbidas.²

The latter commander, when at Thebes on his march northward, is induced by the polemarch Leontiades, leader of a malcontent Bœotian faction, to seize the Theban acropolis, or "Cadmea." The Spartan government, at the instance of Agesilaus, sanction this outrage, and cause Ismenias, the fellow-polemarch and rival of Leontiades, to be put to death.³

After a vigorous campaign, the Lacedæmonian force before Olynthus is routed and dispersed, and its commander Teleutias slain.⁴

By a series of coercive measures, Agesilaus secures the ascendancy of Sparta in the still unsettled republic of Phlius.⁵

Olynthus is reinvested by a more powerful Spartan force under king Agesipolis. After his death from disease, the Olynthians are reduced by famine to accept terms of submission, and to rank among the dependent states of Sparta.⁶

The exiled Theban patriots, by a bold series of stratagems, destroy the traitor Leontiades, and other leading members of the usurping oligarchy, and constrain the Spartan garrison to surrender the Cadmea, and quit the Theban territory.⁷ A Lacedæmonian army invades Bœotia under king Cleombrotus, who returns home after an ineffective campaign, leaving a Spartan force at Thespis, a town in the Sparto-Bœotian interest. The Thebans reassert their ascendancy over the remaining states of that country. After some vacillation, the Athenians are induced to side with Thebes, partly by a treacherous inroad of Sphodrias, the Spartan harmost of Thespis, into their territory.⁸ Agesilaus conducts another large army against Thebes. On his retirement, after an issueless campaign, the charge of the Spartan interest in Bœotia devolves

¹ ii. 1-10.² ii. 11-24.³ ii. 25-30.⁴ iii. 1-9.⁵ iii. 10-17.⁶ iii. 18-26.⁷ iv. 1-12.⁸ iv. 13-33.

on Phœbidas, who is shortly afterwards defeated and slain by the Thebans. Two other abortive expeditions are fitted out against Thebes, one under Agesilaus, the other under Cleombrotus.¹

Several naval actions are fought between the Spartans and Athenians, chiefly in favour of Athens. Timotheus with a powerful fleet reestablishes her interest in the isle of Corcyra.²

BOOK VI. 375—369 B.C.

The Thebans invade Phocis, but on the approach of Lacedæmonian succours under Cleombrotus, retire within their own frontier.³

Polydamas, of Pharsalus in Thessaly, solicits aid from Sparta against Jason of Phæræ, who had already, by a steady course of ambitious policy, made himself supreme over great part of Thessaly, and whom Polydamas represents as aspiring to the dominion of all Greece. But the Lacedæmonians decline to interfere.⁴

Hostilities continue between Athens and Sparta on the coasts of Zante and Corcyra. Mnasippus, sent with a Spartan fleet against the Corcyræans, is defeated and slain under the walls of their city. The discomfited force returns home; and Iphicrates, arriving from Athens with sixty ships, captures a Syracusan squadron sent in aid of the Lacedæmonians.⁵

In a convention held at Sparta, terms of pacification are arranged between Athens and Lacedæmon, for themselves and their respective allies, but are rejected by the Thebans, as trenching on their privilege as leaders of the Bœotian confederacy.⁶ Cleombrotus upon this, invading Bœotia, is defeated and slain in the great battle of Leuctra.⁷

The Athenians, and Jason of Thessaly, decline a proposal from Thebes to unite in a general attack on Sparta, for the permanent humiliation of that republic. Jason, after visiting Thebes in person, and dissuading its rulers from violent measures, is assassinated on his return home to his own residence at Phæræ.⁸

The blow inflicted on the Spartan power at Leuctra, encourages the Mantineans and other minor States of Peloponnesus to assert their right of independent action. The Mantineans rebuild their city, and under the auspices of Athens a new league is formed, for enforcing the privilege of self-government guaranteed by the treaty of Antalcidas. Dissensions arising between Mantinea and

¹ iv. 34—59.

² ii.

³ iv. 60. sqq.

⁴ iii.

⁵ i. 1.

⁶ iv. 1—16.

⁷ i. 2. sqq.

⁸ iv. 19—37.

Tegea, the Lacedæmonians espouse the cause of the latter, the Thebans of the former State. Agesilaus conducts an army into Arcadia, and, after a complicated course of manœuvres without results, returns to Sparta.¹ The Thebans soon after, entering Peloponnesus, and uniting their force to that of the Mantineans, invade and ravage the Lacedæmonian territory.²

The Athenians, after a keen discussion in council, resolve on befriending Sparta in her present emergency. Iphicrates, with a strong force, is dispatched to intercept the retreat of the Thebans; but the latter, outmanœuvring their opponent, effect their return home unmolested.³

Book VII. 369—362 B.C.

Early in the following year, an alliance is contracted between Athens and Sparta. Their combined forces occupy the Corinthian isthmus, in order to prevent the return of the Theban army into Peloponnesus. The Thebans attack and disperse the Lacedæmonian troops stationed in defence of the Pass of Oneum, and effect a junction with their Peloponnesian confederates. Dionysius of Syracuse sends succours to the Spartans. After ravaging the country round Corinth, the Bœotian army recrosses the isthmus.⁴

The Arcadian States form a separate league for their own protection, and defeat a Spartan force at Arsinë. Archidamus, son of Agesilaus, defeats, in their turn, the combined forces of Arcadia and Argos at Midea. A conference of Hellenic States is held at Susa, for the establishment of peace under Persian mediation. The terms sanctioned by the Persian court, on the suggestion of Pelopidas, being unduly favourable to Thebes, are accepted by that republic alone, and the negotiation falls to the ground.⁵ The Thebans cross into Peloponnesus under the command of Epaminondas, who occupies Achaia, but fails in his attempt to establish Theban ascendancy over the States of that country.⁶ A detailed account is given of transactions in the small republics of Sicyon and Phlius.⁷

A special alliance is contracted between the Arcadians and Athenians. Peace is also concluded between Thebes and Corinth; the latter engaging to preserve strict neutrality in regard to the contending interests.⁸

¹ v. 1—22.

² v. 23—32.

³ v. 33. *sqq.*

⁴ i. 1—22.

⁵ i. 23—40.

⁶ i. 41. *sqq.*

⁷ ii. iii.

⁸ iv. 1—11.

War breaks out between the Eleans and the Arcadians, who occupy the Elean territory. The Lacedæmonians take part with Elis, the Thebans with Arcadia. The Lacedæmonians are beaten by the Arcadians in an action near Cromnus; and the victors storm a Lacedæmonian entrenched position. The Arcadian States, without the sanction of their Theban allies, conclude peace and renew friendly relations with Elis.¹ Epaminondas upon this enters Peloponnesus with a large force, for the security of the Theban interest in that country, and establishes his head quarters at Tegea, a friendly Arcadian city. Passing unopposed into Laconia, he again ravages the country round Sparta, but without venturing to assault the city. Returning into Arcadia, he attacks and defeats the combined Peloponnesian and Athenian armies at Mantinea. His own death prevents the achievement of a complete victory, and by mutual consent of the combatants the battle ends, without decisive success on either side.²

2. This work comprises the History of Greece, or such portions of it as the author judged worthy of treatment, during a period of forty-eight years, commencing where Thucydides breaks off, in 411 B.C., and terminating in 362 B.C. It has no pretension to that unity of action which distinguishes the subject of Herodotus, or the original design of Thucydides. The first part is the conclusion of the latter author's great but unfinished historical epopee. The new series of events, which forms the sequel, hence stands in no proper epic relation to that which precedes. Nor can the close of the narrative, the battle of Mantinea, advance any such claim to unjust epic conclusion, as the defeat of Xerxes in Herodotus, or the capture of Athens in the original design of Thucydides. Instead of forming, like each of those events, an epoch of settlement in the affairs of Greece, the victory and death of Epaminondas tended, as Xe-

Plan,
composition,
and
materials.

¹ iv. 12—40.

² v.

nophon himself remarks, still more to disturb and perplex them. But if not in a literary sense a satisfactory consummation, it was the best at the author's disposal. The principal features of Grecian history subsequent to the fall of Athens, are the rise of Theban power at the expense of Sparta, and the ultimate humiliation of the latter state by the Theban patriots Pelopidas and Epaminondas. With the death of Epaminondas the brief ascendancy of Thebes, and the political system of which he had made her the centre, were brought to an end. The battle of Mantinea hence forms, in so far, a historical catastrophe; not indeed of so definite a nature as the issue of the Persian, or the Peloponnesian war; but one which, introducing, as Xenophon observes, a new series of complications in Grecian history, may at least rank as the winding up of the previous series. Had Thucydides lived long enough to complete his design, and had Xenophon, instead of taking up his predecessor's interrupted tale, commenced with the reign of the Thirty tyrants, his narrative would have possessed about as much historical unity as was consistent with the materials at his command.

The work as it stands, inferior as it is to that of Thucydides in extent of research, narrative power, and impartial judgement, may yet rank as an authentic or even critical history. It claims this character, partly as treating solely of contemporaneous events, in many of which the author was engaged; partly as treating them, in regard to the main historical facts, with a due respect for truth. In one sense it may even pretend to a more strictly practical character than the work of Thucydides, its entire freedom from those excursions on legendary matters,

in which Thucydides at times indulges. There is no writer of antiquity who, in his properly historical works, confines himself to real history more closely than Xenophon. For his knowledge of transactions in which he was not himself engaged, he seems to have been still more dependent than Thucydides on oral communications. He nowhere alludes to any kind of written authority, public or private.

The narrative subdivides itself, by the tenor of its own subject, into three parts or periods. The first comprises, in books I.—II., the closing years of the Peloponnesian war, with the ensuing events at Athens down to the expulsion of the Thirty tyrants, in 403 B.C. Being written under Attic feelings and impressions, and centred throughout on the affairs of Athens, this part might not improperly be designated, for distinction sake, Xenophon's Athenian history, or "Attica." The second part, book III. i.—iv., is little less exclusively the history of Lacedæmon, from the commencement of her war with the satraps of Asia Minor in 399 B.C., to the formation of the Corinthian league against her in 395 B.C. The third part is the general History of Greece, from that date to the battle of Mantinea.

Tripartite
character
of the
subject.

Between the first and second of these parts is a gap of about four years, 403—399 B.C.; the only notice taken of the events of those years, being the very inadequate reason which the author assigns for having overlooked them. On concluding his account of the affairs of Athens in the second book, he commences the third by stating that, after these transactions, Cyrus requested and obtained from the Spartans aid in his campaign against his brother: and that a Lacedæmonian squadron, sent to the coast

of Cilicia, prevented the satrap of that province from obstructing the march of the rebel army. The expedition of Cyrus, he adds, "how he collected "his forces and marched against his brother; how he "himself fell in the battle fought between them, and "how the Greeks in his service effected their retreat "to the sea, has been related by Themistogenes of "Syracuse."¹ The book here attributed to Themistogenes is, as will be seen hereafter, the *Anabasis* of Xenophon, which for some mysterious reason he has endeavoured, or affected, to pass off as the production of another person.

The expedition itself was an enterprise belonging properly not to the Greek but the Persian annals. Viewing it however, as Xenophon seems to have done, in the former light, his reason for omitting it from a work purporting to be a general history of Greece, that it had already been separately treated by another writer, is not altogether satisfactory. He offers no apology for his silence regarding Greek affairs at home during those four years. It is true that the proper subjects for historical composition were, in his time, understood to be limited chiefly to wars waged by the confederate states, among themselves or against foreign enemies; while the details of internal politics, with the general progress of society, were overlooked. And this was certainly a period of political lull and repose, owing partly to the exhaustion consequent on the Peloponnesian war, partly to the vigour with which Sparta enforced her supremacy, by checking any attempt at energetic action unless directed by herself. But a more diligent writer even

¹ III. i. 2.

of this period (such as Thucydides) would hardly have failed at least to examine the causes of this prolonged state of inactivity. He would have brought the tranquillity which prevailed, into connexion with the past and future periods of disturbance. He would have shown how the oppressive policy of Sparta alienated her former friends, and irritated her lately intimidated rivals to renewed hostility. The adventures of Conon after his defeat at Ægospotami, the preparations in which he was engaged for restoring the fortunes of Athens, with the measures adopted at home to reconsolidate her shattered political system, might also have suggested themselves to an Attic writer of more comprehensive views, as legitimate materials for imparting to this portion of his text, completeness in itself and connexion with the remainder. To Xenophon these topics offered little interest, being neither themselves of a striking character, nor congenial to his Spartan sympathies. He has therefore, to use a familiar phrase, "skipped over" altogether the four years, from the winding up of the affairs of Athens in 403 B.C. to the commencement of Thimbron's campaign (399 B.C.) against the Persian satraps.¹

¹ Xenophon distinctly makes the Spartan wars against Elis, described by him in III. ii. 21. sqq., contemporaneous with the campaigns of Derkyllidas in Asia in 399—397 B.C. The chronology of Diodorus preferred by Grote, which places those wars in 402—400 B.C., may possibly be better in itself; but we cannot admit with Grote (note to vol. x. p. 316.) that the language of Xenophon can, by any reasonable latitude of interpretation, be made to harmonise with the arrangement of Diodorus. Dodwell, and after him Clinton and Thirlwall, without any attempt to reconcile the two authors, adopt the date of 401, which agrees with neither. Krüger (ad Clint. an. 400) and Sievers (*Geschichte Griechenl.* p. 382.) prefer the date of Xenophon; as we have here also done; to the extent at least of being convinced that Xeno-

Attic
history.

3. Xenophon nowhere appears to greater advantage as a Historian than in the first two books of the *Hellenica*. This part of the work being a continuation of Thucydides, whose history must therefore have been habitually in his hands, it might seem as if the mantle of his predecessor had been spread for the time, however loosely, over his shoulders. His narrative is here both more dignified, more full of matter, and more apparently free from prejudice, than any other portion of his text. It was probably compiled before his Laconian partialities were fully matured, and when afterwards finally digested, may have retained the impressions under which it was first designed. His characteristic indifference to local Athenian politics, tended to place him beyond the reach of secondary influences in his account of the party struggles of this period. In describing the tyranny of the Thirty and its overthrow, his sympathies are entirely on the constitutional side. He manifests a cordial detestation of the Tyrants, with a warm interest in the cause, and admiration for the character of Thrasybulus. He enlarges at times in glowing language on his victorious progress, and on the humiliating defeats sustained by the hostile faction from within the city, and by their Lacedæmonian supporters from without. Perhaps the strongest argument of the genuine Attic feeling which here guided his pen, is to be found in the testimony borne

phon's real view of the case, whether right or wrong, was that which his words express, taken in their natural sense. Nor, careless as he occasionally is of historical precision, can we believe that he could ever have made a mistake of three years in the date of events with which he was contemporaneous; and writing too on the Elean territory, on the very spot where those events took place, and where everything concerning them must have been matter of notoriety.

at the close¹, to the beneficial influence which the return to democratic forms exercised on the fortunes of the republic. This passage seems to vouch for his own conviction that democracy, whatever its defects in theory, was better adapted to his own country than any other form of government. It also conveys an indirect compliment to Athens, and a declaration of interest in her affairs, which written, as its terms evince, long posterior to his banishment, proves, with other evidence to be adduced in the sequel, that through all the vicissitudes of his destiny, the vestal fire of Attic patriotism was never extinguished in his bosom.

While Xenophon thus stigmatises the ferocious tyranny of the Thirty, he no less clearly marks his abhorrence of the conduct of the old democratic government, in the lamentable affair of the Six admirals. His account of this transaction has been censured, and not altogether without reason, as meagre and indistinct. But the alleged defects may with greater justice be sought in the matter treated than in the mode of treatment; in the vindictive cruelty and levity of the Athenian populace, who refused to submit the case to that dispassionate investigation, which the first principles of justice and the law of their own community prescribed; who, without hearing witnesses, and in violation of one of their own favourite statutes, hurried to execution six patriotic citizens, not many days after they had, at a time when the fortunes of Athens depended on the issue of a single battle, won for her one of the most decisive victories in the annals of her military achievement.

Among other proofs of Xenophon's impartiality,

¹ II. iv. 43.

it may be remarked, that while one eminent modern authority¹ has taxed him with "studiously keeping "back the case against the admirals," in order to throw odium on the democracy, another² attributes his neglect to bring out the full merits of their case, to a "fear of giving offence to his Spartan patrons;" those "who took the lead against the accused" being "instruments of the oligarchal party." An arbiter charged with undue favour to each litigant, may reasonably be presumed to have dealt equal justice to both.³

Lacedæ-
monian,
history.

The portion of the Hellenica which has above been classed as its second period, may not perhaps appear deserving, either in respect to its own bulk or the time which it embraces, of being set apart in so marked a manner. It derives however, from the mode in which the narrative is concentrated round the affairs of Sparta, a distinctness of character, similar to that which the first period derives from a like concentration round the affairs of Athens. Those of the other Greek states are noticed, in so far only as was necessary to describe the measures taken by Sparta for maintaining her supremacy. The wars carried on by Lacedæmon, during the four years from 399 to 395 B.C., under Thimbron, Dercyllidas, and Agesilaus, against the satraps of Asia Minor, form the main subject, and are treated in copious detail. The Historian was now a banished man, living under Spartan protection. Full scope is accordingly given to his Laconian sympathies, but as yet without those more palpable signs of ill-will towards other states, the occasion for which first arose with the subsequent European quarrels.

¹ Grote, Hist. of Greece, vol. VIII. p. 248.

³ See Appendix M.

² Thirlwall, Hist. of Greece vol. IV. p. 123—126.

In the third period the confederacy resumes its free course of political action, suspended since the close of the Peloponnesian war. Athens, Thebes, and Argos, subsidised by Persia, unite for the common object of shaking off the Spartan yoke. Of this league the most important member was Thebes, lately the principal ally of her present adversary, her struggle with whom for equality of rights, in the war now commenced, gradually became a fierce, and in the end successful contest for supremacy. Athens, in the course of the same vicissitudes, was content to play a middle part, siding with one or other of the two chief combatants, as her feelings or interests might dictate. The whole of this portion of the work is written under the full and, as will be seen, baneful influence of the author's Laconian partialities.

Hellenic history.

Each of these divisions of the Hellenica contains evidence, not only of the political feelings, but of the more immediate personal impressions under which it was written. It is a reasonable, if not a necessary supposition, that the first two books were the first composed; and the characteristic features of their composition seem to evince, that their materials were compiled contemporaneously with the events and on the spot. The author's descriptions of the landing of Alcibiades, of the proceedings against the admirals, of the last days and death of Theramenes, of the war of the Piræus, indicate in their truthful reality an immediate knowledge of, and interest in, the scenes described. Xenophon could not indeed at that time have contemplated a continuation of Thucydides, who was still alive and engaged in writing. It is more likely that he had planned, in the first instance, an independent history; no part of his predecessor's work

Xenophon's personal knowledge of the events described.

having been published till after the close of the Peloponnesian war. It was on the appearance probably of the first seven books of Thucydides, followed at no distant interval by his death, and by the consignment of the unfinished eighth book to Xenophon for publication, that he was led to arrange his own materials in their present form, as a continuation of the incomplete text of his predecessor.

Similar traces of personal knowledge are observable in the transactions of the second period, and the earlier years of the third. That Xenophon attended Agesilaus on his campaigns in Asia and Northern Greece, we know from himself; and this part of his narrative is a careful chronicle of his patron's acts. There can also be little doubt that he passed the previous years, in great part at least, in Asia with the Lacedæmonian army. Here, too, several of his scenes are worked up with the precision of an eye-witness.¹ The last passage of the Hellenica in which similar signs can be discerned of his presence at the event described, is his graphic account of the check given to the pride of his Spartan patron at Corinth, by the sudden intelligence of a great disaster.² Down to this date, 392 B.C., Xenophon was still probably attached to the suite of Agesilaus. His permanent settlement at Scillus may have taken place about the close of the same year.³ Hence, although many parts of his subsequent narrative show an intimate knowledge of public affairs derived from primary sources, there is no similar evidence of his descriptions being founded on personal observation.

As the crisis of Grecian history, around which

¹ III. i. 10. sqq., IV. i. 3. sq.

² IV. v. 7.

³ Anab. v. iii. 7.

the interest of this most important part of the Hellenica revolves, is the overthrow of Spartan supremacy by Thebes, and as the favour of Xenophon to Lacedæmon and his hostility to Thebes here impart the pervading tone to his narrative, it will be proper to examine more closely the origin of these tendencies.

4. Xenophon's Spartan sympathies appear to connect themselves chiefly with events posterior to his banishment, but may also in part be due to previous influences. "Laconism," or an undue partiality for Lacedæmonian habits and interests, was a prevailing sentiment among the upper class in Athens during her flourishing age; as a consequence, partly of the leaning of men of the aristocratic order to aristocratic government, partly of the distaste of enlightened politicians for the extreme of democracy existing at home. It was common among the disciples of Socrates, and may hence have been imbibed in early youth by Xenophon. The internal evidence however of his works implies, that it was not until a late period that any such feeling acquired a serious ascendancy over his Attic patriotism. The *Anabasis*¹ indicates no doubt a strong, and in an Athenian undignified, sense of the power of Sparta; but it shows little trace of Laconism in the proper sense. The author seems rather to glory in his Attic citizenship. He looks forward with pride to the honour which, on his return to Greece, his achievements will reflect on his country.² He also, in his conduct of the retreat, marks his preference for the services of Athenian warriors.³ At Byzantium we first observe a disposi-

His
Spartan
partial-
ities.

¹ *Anab.* vi. i. 26.

² *Anab.* vi. i. 20.

³ *Supra*, p. 248.

tion to court Lacedæmonian patronage, owing probably to the signs which he then discerned of impending calamity at home. No Laconian connexion was however formed at this time. His services in bringing over the Cyreians from Thrace to the Spartan camp, with the refuge afforded him after his sentence of exile by the Spartan commanders in Asia, were his first permanent ties to the Lacedæmonian interest. His attachment in the sequel to king Agesilaus, formed the climax of his Spartomania. So entirely indeed does this feeling henceforward become centred in the person of his royal protector, that his favour to the nation at large appears much in the light of a radiation from his enthusiasm for that one revered object. The fundamental principle of his judgement on Lacedæmonian policy is, that Agesilaus, its prime mover, can do no wrong. Sparta may err, however rarely; and against her citizens in their corporate capacity, even where the error has been committed at the instance or with the express sanction of Agesilaus, the censure, if administered at all, is directed.

His
Theban
anti-
pathies.

Xenophon's antipathy to Thebes finds its best explanation in his love for Sparta. His Attic patriotism was never probably so fervent, as to render him strongly susceptible of the old spirit of national antagonism between Thebes and Athens. Nor do the notices of his early life suggest personal grounds of dislike. The only friend of his youth whom, besides Socrates, he mentions by name, is the Bœotian Proxenus, his esteem for whom gave so momentous a turn to his fortunes. Of the two thousand warriors who followed the standard of that adventurer, a large part may be presumed to have been his own countrymen;

and these were the men who after his death elected Xenophon, by a unanimous vote, over the heads of their own officers, to the vacant command. It is not likely that so high an honour would have been so cordially conferred on a stranger who entertained a dislike to their nation; nor would it be fair to Xenophon to suppose him insensible to such a mark of esteem. The fidelity with which his men adhered to him during the dissensions in the camp, would tend to maintain this friendly feeling. We hear indeed of one Bœotian officer as hostile to his interests.¹ But his two bitterest enemies, whose machinations against him were in part successful, Neon² and Dexippus³, were Lacedæmonians. In a comparison therefore between the two nations, the Theban ought hitherto to have been stronger than the Laconian interest. From the time however when Xenophon's connexion with Sparta was fully matured, numerous causes conspired to extinguish any friendly feeling towards Thebes. By Thebes the power of Sparta was broken, her military superiority annihilated, her armies defeated, her best commanders out-generalled, her fairest provinces wrested from her dominion; and all this, while Agesilaus was the chief director of her councils. The less wonder that Agesilaus, as the Historian⁴ emphatically tells us, should have hated Thebes; and where Agesilaus hated, it was not possible that Xenophon could love. Accordingly his notices of Thebes and her affairs, subsequent to her quarrel with Sparta, everywhere exhibit a gloomy cold repugnance, a systematic suppression or depreciation of her honourable actions and her illustrious

¹ Anab. v. vi. 21.² v. vii. 1. sqq., vi. iv. 23., vii. ii.³ vi. i. 32., vi. 11.⁴ Hellen. v. i. 33. : conf. Plutarch, Agesil. 22.

names, and an anxiety to represent all her acts in the least creditable light.

State of
Greece.

Sparta.

A concise view of the policy of Sparta and of Thebes, before and after the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, will enable us the better to appreciate the power of these philo-Laconian and miso-Bœotian influences on the Historian's judgment. At the former epoch, Sparta's leadership of continental Greece rested on her moral influence as much as on her military power. She looked, or affected to look, less to the submission of the confederate republics, than their voluntary attachment to herself as the champion of Hellenic liberty. So little was she suspected of ambitious schemes, that the chief complaint against her on the part of her allies, was her slowness to assert her rights and their own, against the open oppression and usurpation of Athens.¹ Hence the principle asserted by the Lacedæmonian party in those days, and but faintly denied by Athens, that the Spartans were the upholders, the Athenians the destroyers of Grecian liberty. The ensuing twenty-seven years' war, and its triumphant issue, wrought a complete change in the Spartan federal policy.² The overthrow of Athenian tyranny did but make room for the establishment by the victor of a new system of her own, surpassing in oppressiveness that which it supplanted. Her overbearing conduct towards her allies tended, still more than her harshness to her vassals, to estrange the Hellenic body from her interests, and at last instigated the other leading republics, by a combined effort, to shake off the yoke,

Thucyd. i. 69. sqq. alibi.

² See the graphic description of this change in Aristid. t. i. p. 208. sqq. Jebb.

and restore to each her just share in the management of the common interests. The ulterior result of this movement was the rise of Theban ascendancy on the ruins of that of Sparta.

During the whole flourishing age of Greece, Thebes had been remarkable among the Hellenic states for the inert character of her institutions, and the intellectual torpor of her citizens. Great and opulent in city and territory, according to the standard of Greek republican greatness, chief of a body of kindred states extending over a broad and fertile region, and second to none in military prowess, she had maintained a position of independence towards both Sparta and Athens, without having ever aspired to share with them the honour of "Hegemony," or leadership. The ruling principle of her policy had been, from time immemorial, hatred of Athens, with whom her geographical position kept her in a continual state of antagonism; and the dogged spirit of local patriotism with which, before the Persian war, she struggled to maintain her own against the superior energy of her neighbour, became the chief or only ground of her apostasy to the foreign invader.¹ The same anti-Attic spirit had, until lately, guided her councils, and secured her adherence to Sparta during the Peloponnesian war. But the disasters of her old enemy produced a change of feeling. The danger that now threatened her independence from the undivided despotism of Sparta, seemed greater than any to which it had been exposed from Athens even in her best days. From the moment therefore when the latter state showed signs of revival from her late

Thebes
and
Athens.

¹ See Vol. IV. p. 446. sqq.

political torpor, Thebes drew towards her as a confederate in resistance to the common oppressor.

Lysander
and
Agesilaus.

Two men, Lysander and Agesilaus, were mainly instrumental to the fall of Lacedæmon ; two, Pelopidas and Epaminondas, to the rise of Thebes. The two former both possessed in a high degree, the qualities common to the more distinguished of their countrymen. Both were men of great energy and military talent : both good Spartan patriots ; zealous in their efforts to aggrandise their country, and by the same means to achieve personal renown. In the pursuit of these objects Lysander, a man of tyrannical temper and large ambition, seems to have been restrained by no considerations of justice or humanity. By him, as the elder of the two, as the conqueror of Athens, and the first establisher of Spartan supremacy, was also established the system of coercion by which it was maintained. The same system was continued by Agesilaus, a man of milder more generous temper, in forms less harsh and cruel, but in special instances still more offensive than the undisguised tyranny of Lysander. The measures of the latter had been directed chiefly against the smaller states, at a time when, owing to the exhaustion of the greater powers, no opposition could be offered. Agesilaus persisted in the same domineering spirit, with inferior means, against adversaries more powerful, and actuated by a determined spirit of resistance. To maintain the Spartan supremacy against the difficulties with which she had now to contend, required a firm, but cautious and conciliatory policy, of which Agesilaus had no clear conception. His only resource was a vigorous exercise of the military power of Sparta, in coercing

rivals or enemies ; at first by its bold and honest exercise ; afterwards, when irritated by resistance, in defiance of treaties or the law of nations. The worst of these acts of joint treachery and violence was the seizure of the Theban citadel, or " Cadmea," in time of peace, by a Lacedæmonian force, then on its way through Bœotia to Thrace. This step, which though taken in the first instance by a rash subordinate on his sole responsibility, was afterwards sanctioned by Agesilaus, may be considered as the turning point from which Lacedæmon, after reaching the climax of her greatness, verged to her decline.

5. The seizure of the Cadmea first brought into full activity the two greatest, the only really great public characters whom Thebes was ever destined to produce, Pelopidas and Epaminondas ; in the aggregate of their qualities, perhaps the two most excellent of Hellenic patriots, and the latter of the two the most accomplished of Hellenic warriors. It forms no part of our office to enlarge on the lives or genius of these two remarkable men, which are nearly as familiar in the page of universal as of Grecian history. It will here suffice briefly to note the principal transactions in which they were engaged, as recorded, partly by Xenophon, partly in other more authentic quarters, in order to judge of the estimation in which they were held, or the amount of notice with which they have been honoured, by the leading historian of the time. Pelopidas, the elder of the two, has the chief merit of planning and executing the hazardous plot, by which the traitorous home faction was destroyed, and the Spartans were driven from Thebes

Pelopidas
and Epami-
nondas.

and her territory.¹ The share of Epaminondas in this enterprise, from a conscientious aversion to shed the blood of a fellow-citizen even in a just cause, was limited to the military operations against the foreigners.² Chiefly by his able strategy, four successive attempts of Sparta to regain a footing on Theban ground, two under Cleombrotus and two under Agesilaus, were baffled or repulsed. Athens, irritated by the sudden attempt of a Spartan force, under Sphodrias, to seize the Piræus, as the Cadmea had been seized, in violation of the existing peace, espouses the cause of Thebes. In addition to other minor successes of the Theban arms³, Pelopidas, with less than half the numbers of his opponents, defeats the two Spartan generals Gorgoleon and Theopompus, in the decisive battle of Tegyra.⁴ The result was the expulsion of the Lacedæmonians from Bœotia. The Athenians, jealous of the growing power of their new ally, make separate proposals of pacification. In a congress held at Sparta, Epaminondas, after a spirited altercation with the overbearing Agesilaus, repudiates as dishonourable to his country the terms on which it was proposed to include her in the treaty.⁵ Exasperated by his presumption, Agesilaus moves the Spartan government to send an army against Thebes, under his colleague Cleombrotus, who is defeated by Epaminondas with an inferior force, and himself slain, in the decisive battle of Leuctra.

¹ Auctt. ap. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, vol. v. p. 34. sqq., second edition; Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, vol. x. p. 111. sqq.; Sievers, *Geschichte Griechenl. von 404 bis 362 v. Chr.*, p. 170. sqq.

² Thirlwall, p. 35.; Grote, p. 112. 168.; Sievers, p. 181.

³ Grote, p. 182.

⁴ Thirlwall, p. 62.; Grote, p. 182.; Sievers, p. 211.

⁵ Thirlwall, p. 88. sq.; Grote, p. 226. sq.; Sievers, p. 237.

From this epoch the ascendancy of Sparta in Greece is at an end. Her harmosts are ejected from the vassal cities, which everywhere reassert their right of independent action. An Arcadian league is formed for the security of the contracting states against Spartan aggression, and under the direction of Epaminondas a new common seat of government, the great city of Megalopolis, is erected.¹ Epaminondas invades and ravages Laconia. The Messenians revolt from Sparta, and are established in their antient possessions and liberties by Epaminondas, who, on the site of their old metropolis Ithome, constructs a noble city, the remains of which still attract admiration as the finest extant models of Greek military architecture.² Pelopidas, conducting a force into Thessaly, to protect the allies of Thebes in that region, against the usurpations of Alexander tyrant of Phæræ, extends Theban influence over great part of Thessaly into Macedonia.³ He then undertakes a mission to the Persian court, to solicit the Great King's mediation in establishing peace among the Greek powers; but the negotiation proves abortive. Returning to Thessaly, he is treacherously made prisoner by Alexander. A Theban army, under the command of Epaminondas, enforces his release. In a subsequent battle Alexander is defeated by Pelopidas, who is himself slain; but the result of his victory is to reduce Alexander under military vassalage to Thebes.⁴ Epaminondas again conducts an army into Peloponnesus, and again ravages the

¹ Thirlwall, p. 112.; Grote, p. 306. sq.; Sievers, p. 255.

² Thirlwall, p. 133.; Grote, p. 308. sqq.; Sievers, p. 272. sq.

³ Thirlwall, p. 154. sqq.; Grote, p. 387. sqq.; Sievers, p. 320.

⁴ Thirlwall, p. 188. sq.; Grote, p. 420. sqq.; Sievers, p. 332.

Spartan plain. On his return he defeats the Spartan-Athenian forces at Mantinea, but falls in the moment of victory.

Xenophon's
Theban
history.

Let us compare this outline of the authentic history of Thebes and her two greatest citizens, during her most glorious era, with the part which they have been permitted to act in the Hellenic history of Xenophon.

No mention is made of either Pelopidas or Epaminondas till towards the close of the life of each. Pelopidas appears but once on the scene; the occasion selected being that of his mission to Susa, the least creditable undertaking recorded of him. The recovery of the Cadmea, with the other acts of the ensuing twelve most glorious years of the two patriots, in so far as noticed at all, are ascribed to anonymous or secondary actors. The victory of Tegyra, the first serious blow to the martial reputation of Sparta, is not mentioned. In the account of the battle of Leuctra, no such persons as Epaminondas or Pelopidas are alluded to, the authors of that brilliant achievement being designated merely by Xenophon's customary expression of "the Thebans," or "the Theban commanders." The campaigns of Pelopidas in Thessaly and Macedonia, events of peculiar interest, both as attesting the spread of Theban power in new regions, and as links in the subsequent chain of connexion between Greece and the latter country, find no place in Xenophon's narrative; as little the death of Pelopidas at the close of his career of northern conquest. Of the presence of Epaminondas in the congress of Sparta in 371 B.C., of his eloquent vindication of the rights of Thebes against Agesilaus, and the ebullition of petulant wrath on the part of

the latter at his boldness, which have supplied material for spirited episodes to other historians, we hear nothing in the *Hellenica*. "The Thebans" are there simply mentioned as having objected to the treaty on grounds stated. Xenophon dwells on the first invasion and devastation of the Spartan plain, where the smoke of an enemy's fire during the six hundred years of Sparta's existence had never before been seen, as a striking event in Grecian history.¹ But the author and leader of the enterprise obtains no higher credit for it than any other "Theban." The wresting of Messenia from Sparta, and establishment of her independence, the most fatal blow inflicted on the latter state, with the foundation of the new city of Messenë, and that of the Arcadian Megalopolis, all under the auspices of Epaminondas, are blank pages in the volume of our Historian. By a coincidence probably not accidental, the name of Epaminondas is first mentioned a few years before his death, in connexion, like that of Pelopidas, with the only abortive enterprise in which he seems to have ever been engaged, his attempt to organise an Achaean league in the interest of Thebes.²

To these astounding suppressions, chiefly connected with the affairs of these two patriots, may be added some others in the previous vicissitudes of Sparto-Bœotian warfare. Among Theban warriors or statesmen, the next in eminence to those two was Ismenias, described also by Plutarch as the political chief under whom they were trained. This valiant soldier and good citizen, after the Theban victory of Haliartus,

¹ *Hellen.* vi. v. 23. sqq.

² vii. i. 41.

led a force into Thessaly, wrested from the Spartans their much-cherished colony of Heraclea, induced Pharsalus and other Lacedæmonian dependencies to revolt, and returning homewards, defeated a Sparto-Phocian army at Naryx, with the loss of a thousand men and of their Spartiate commander.¹ Not a word of all this occurs in Xenophon. Ismenias is mentioned by him but on two occasions; first, as one of the Thebans² to whom were transmitted the subsidies, or as Xenophon implies the bribes, employed by Tithraustes to bring about the anti-Spartan league of Corinth; secondly, as the colleague of Leontiades in the office of polemarch, when the latter betrayed the Cadmea; and as having, as chief of the patriot party, and with the sanction of Agesilaus, been put to death by the Lacedæmonian government. The same concealment of Theban names, already noticed in the more glaring cases of Epaminondas and Pelopidas, is also observable in regard to persons of secondary rank. In no instance, except that of Epaminondas towards the close of his career, has our historian given the name of a single individual commanding or engaged, on the side of Thebes, in any one of her battles or victories. At Haliartus, Corinth, Coronea, Thespiis, Leuctra (not to mention Naryx, Tegyra, and others which he suppresses), "the Thebans," in their collective capacity, are still both generals and soldiers.

Contrast of
his Spartan
history.

This systematic iniquity towards the one side, to be fully appreciated, must be compared with the parallel system of favouritism to the other. While

¹ Grote, vol. ix. p. 420. sq.; Sievers, p. 65. sq.

² Hellen. iii. v. 1.: conf. Grote, vol. ix. pp. 400, 401. note 2.; Thirlwall, vol. iv. p. 418.

so many great achievements of Thebes are overlooked or vilipended, every petty enterprise of her adversary is lauded and exaggerated, in all its circumstantiality of events and persons. The contrast cannot be better illustrated than by the fact that while, as already observed, Epaminondas is the single Theban mentioned by name as taking part in the thirty-three years of Sparto-Theban warfare described by Xenophon, upwards of forty Lacedæmonians, generals, captains, subordinate officers, and soldiers in the ranks, are particularised. The abortive incursion of Agesilaus into the territory of his petty neighbour Mantinea¹, is described, apparently as a rival exploit to the nearly simultaneous march of Epaminondas from Thebes to the headlands of Laconia, with a pomp of strategic detail which imparts a tinge of burlesque to the narrative. A like great and disproportionate prominence is assigned to the Acarnanian, Olynthian, and Argive incursions of Agesilaus and Agesipolis.² While the Thessalian enterprises of Ismenias, Pelopidas, and Epaminondas are unmentioned, about ten pages are devoted to the reasons why Lacedæmon might have undertaken into the same country a similar expedition, which she never undertook; followed by a long account of such subsequent vicissitudes of the same family of Thessalian despots, as did not happen to involve any allusion to their subjection to Thebes.³ The unreasonable amount of space devoted to the little republic of Phlius, is also acknowledged by Xenophon to be a tribute to her zeal for Sparta and Agesilaus.⁴

¹ VI. v. 15—22. ² IV. vi. vii., v. ii. iii. ³ VI. i. iv. 27. sqq. ⁴ VII. ii.

Battle of
Corinth.

6. The Historian's partiality is equally observable in the unfair colouring given to those acts of "the Thebans" which he records. In his description of the battles of Corinth and Coronea, he does not deny that in each they were victorious on their own part of the confederate line, but he admits it in such a manner as to make their success in the one case appear actually discreditable to them, in the other as little creditable as possible. At Corinth he represents them as afraid of facing the Lacedæmonians (whom they had lately beaten single-handed at Haliartus), and as having, by an unworthy artifice, forced on the engagement on a day when they happened, from their position, to be opposed to inferior troops of the enemy, while the Athenians had to bear the brunt of the Spartan attack. The facts of the case were these. It had been agreed between the Athenians and Thebans, that they should occupy in turns the right and left of the confederate line, as the first and second post of honour. The Lacedæmonians, on their side, permanently occupied the right, as their recognised privilege. The action consequently must have been fought on a day when either the Athenians or the Thebans were opposed to the Lacedæmonians. It eventually took place on one when the former were in that position. Subjoined is Xenophon's commentary on these facts. "The Bœotians, while stationed on the left, were in no hurry to bring on the action; but when occupying the right, with the Achæans for their opponents, they immediately pronounced the auspices favourable, and gave orders to prepare for battle."¹ He adds,

¹ iv. ii. 18. sqq.

that, in order to give additional weight to their attack, they increased the depth of their phalanx beyond the sixteen files common to the other contingents; the result of which was so to contract the confederate line towards the left, where the Athenians were, as to enable the Lacedæmonians to take them in flank and surround them. Hence, while the Bœotians on their side were victorious, the Athenians were defeated with heavy loss. Here we have an example, among others, of the mode in which Xenophon insinuates injurious charges which he does not venture to affirm. His imputations however will hardly stand the test of critical analysis, founded on other data supplied by his own narrative. The statement that "no sooner did the Bœotians find themselves opposed to the Achæans, than they declared the auspices favourable, and gave orders to "prepare for battle," is obviously meant to imply, without actually asserting, that the auspices, not being really favourable, had been falsified by the Bœotians. Had the auspices been really favourable, Xenophon was much too pious a man to censure a course adopted with the sanction of the gods. The question then arises: How happened it that a confederate army, rated by him at 27,000 men, including 6000 Athenians, should have left the common sacrificial rites entirely in the hands of the Bœotians, numbering scarcely 5000 men, to be tampered with by their leaders at their pleasure: and how happened it that the commanders of this Bœotian fraction of the army, had it in their power to select the moment of the attack at their exclusive discretion, without consulting their colleagues? These points, so necessary to a right understanding of the case, are all left in vague

obscurity. With regard to the attack itself, it appears from his own account that the Spartans were taken by surprise, and in so far that the moment of onset was well chosen. Nor can we fairly overlook, as he naturally does, the consideration that, while the Bœotians were barely 5000 strong, and those in great part not Thebans, the Athenians were 6000 strong; or how much more desirable it was that the 6000 Lacedæmonians should be opposed by an equal number of first-class troops, forming one united national force, than by a mixed body of inferior numbers. In regard to the other charge, of increasing the depth of their phalanx, Xenophon insinuates, but here again does not venture to assert, that the increase was made in breach of an engagement that the whole confederate line should be drawn up sixteen deep. That the Thebans should have come under any such engagement seems the less probable, from the knowledge we possess that an extra depth of phalanx formed part of their habitual system of tactics, that of bearing down the enemy by the weight of their main body of men at arms. By this system, not only here but in their former wars, at Delium¹ in particular, they succeeded in breaking the line opposed to them; and the same tactics, matured and improved by Epaminondas, won for them the great victories of Leuctra and Mantinea. But, apart from this, how can Xenophon's account of the matter be reconciled with his statement of the relative strength of the two armies? The confederate force is described by himself as outnumbering the Peloponnesians in the ratio of nearly two to one, or as about 27,000 to 14,000. The no-

¹ Thucyd. iv. 93.

tion of an army being outflanked and surrounded, as he expresses it, by another of half its size, seems purely absurd, unless its leaders were guilty of some far greater folly or treachery than any which Xenophon here imputes to "the Thebans." The improbability becomes the greater from their superiority in cavalry. That the rout of the Athenians was owing, as much or more, to their own mismanagement as to any other cause, there is further strong evidence in a previous part of the Historian's text, where his object was not to vilify the Thebans or vindicate his countrymen, but to glorify the Spartans. We are there told that the loss of the latter in this action amounted to but eight men. Six thousand Athenians who, whether outflanked or not, allowed themselves to be put to the rout by an equal number of opponents, at so small an expense to the enemy, could hardly have done justice to the line of battle of which they formed part.¹ Add to all this, that not one of the other contemporary, and for the most part Attic, writers, who describe this battle, hint at the severe loss of their countrymen, as owing either to treachery or mismanagement on the part of their allies. Plato, in particular, ascribes their defeat to the disadvantage of the ground on which they fought.²

The battle of Coronea was in all essential respects a counterpart of that of Corinth just described. The Thebans were here also on the right of the line, opposed to the Orchomenians; the Argives and Athenians on the left, opposed to the Spartans. The Thebans were victorious on the one flank, the

Battle of
Coronea.

¹ Hellen. iv. iii. 1.

² Menex. p. 245. : conf. Grote, vol. ix. p. 428.; Sievers, p. 68.

Spartans on the rest of the line. Here again the details are supplied, omitted, or coloured, so as to reflect most honour on Agesilaus and least on the Thebans. Diodorus¹ describes the Thebans as having on the first onset defeated the right of their opponents. Xenophon also represents them as the first to charge; but without mentioning the result, he passes off to a description of the prowess of Agesilaus on the other flank. While those around the king, he continues, "were crowning him on his victory, word was brought that the Thebans had broken through the Orchomenians and fallen upon the baggage; upon which he put his army in motion, in order to intercept their retreat. The Thebans in the meanwhile, perceiving their confederates in full flight towards Helicon, closed up their phalanx, and advanced boldly to cut their way through to them." And here Xenophon's zeal to glorify his favourite hero reaches a marvellous pitch of extravagance. Instead of commending the valour of the Thebans for preferring so hazardous a mode of retreat, he is lost in admiration of Agesilaus for opposing their attempt. "Upon this occasion," he exclaims, "one may indeed, without risk of contradiction, pronounce Agesilaus to have shown himself a valiant warrior. For it being in his power to let the Thebans pass through his line and then assail them from behind, he preferred engaging them face to face; when after a fierce conflict, a portion succeeded in fighting their way through, but many were slain in the attempt." Xenophon's partiality may here be estimated, by comparing the account given of this affair by Plu-

¹ XIV. 84.

tarch, also a warm admirer of Agesilaus, and whose version appears to differ only in rendering equal justice to both sides. "The Spartans," he says, "met them (the retiring Thebans) with equal courage, and the conflict was fierce along their whole line, but chiefly where Agesilaus fought, and where the devoted valour of those around him scarcely enabled them to carry him wounded off the field. But their efforts to repulse the charge of the Thebans were unavailing, and they were obliged in the end to resort to the course, which at first they were unwilling to adopt, of opening a passage, and then, as the enemy passed in somewhat less steady order, harassing his flanks. But the Thebans never gave way, and reached Helicon much elated with the action, as having been no defeat, in so far as they were concerned."¹

It has been well remarked by an eminent modern Leuctra. historian², that Xenophon's account of the battle of Leuctra "seems to contain little more than the pretences by which the Spartans, to console themselves for their defeat, endeavoured to detract from the skill and valour of their enemies." Their apologist begins by making the honour of their king Cleombrotus a sort of scape-goat for that of his army.³ He is charged in the Historian's indirect manner, first with being disinclined to fight from unpatriotic favour to the Thebans; secondly, with having entered the field in a state of intoxication. The Thebans, it is further said, were encouraged, the Lacedæmonians disheartened, by omens unfavourable to the latter. The next advantage mentioned on the Theban side,

¹ Plut. Agesil. 18. : conf. Grote, vol. ix. p. 438. ; Sievers, p. 72.

² Thirlwall, vol. v. p. 93.

³ vi. iv. 5. sqq.

supplies a surprising instance of the shifts to which he has in extreme cases been driven by his philo-Laconian zeal. "When the engagement appeared imminent, a body of Bœotian suttlers and baggage drivers, with some skulkers from the ranks, while making their way off the field, were intercepted by the Lacedæmonian cavalry and light troops, and forced back upon their own lines. By this means the numbers of the Bœotian army were greatly increased." According to Xenophon therefore, the overthrow of the Lacedæmonian empire in Hellas, was mainly owing to the services of a rabble of unarmed or cowardly camp followers; for it seems clear, from other less partial authorities¹, that the Spartan force in the proper sense was more numerous than that of Thebes. He further pleads the superiority of the Theban horse in number and training; a singular instance probably, of the issue of a great pitched battle between two first-class Hellenic armies, being made to depend on the services of a few hundred at no time very efficient cavalry. As a last resource he endeavours to prove (the fact being in other accounts the reverse) that the Lacedæmonians at the outset had the best of the battle, and that its loss was owing to their being disheartened by the death of Cleombrotus; the same whose backwardness to engage had just been quoted as a cause of discouragement. "That Cleombrotus," he argues, "had at first the advantage, is evinced by the fact, that after he was wounded, those around him succeeded in carrying him off the field, which they could not have done had they not been the victors up to that

¹ Plutarch, Pelop. 23.

“moment.” As if no such thing had ever been heard of, as a commander wounded and carried off the field in the moment of defeat.

7. In his account of the first invasion of Laconia by “the Thebans,” Xenophon has suppressed the principal object which Epaminondas had in view and accomplished during his stay in the peninsula. He is described¹ as having, on completing his operations in Laconia, returned at once to Thebes, evading by the way an Athenian force sent to obstruct his march. According to the unanimous testimony of other authorities², he remained in Peloponnesus from three to four months, occupied chiefly with his greatest stroke of anti-Spartan policy, the restoration of Messenian independence.

Messenian
independ-
ence.

Xenophon accuses the Thebans, not only of having been the aggressors in their first quarrel with Sparta, but of having, by a piece of political chicanery, transferred from themselves to others the odium of disturbing the national peace. They stirred up, he tells us³, a war between the Locrians and the Phocians, in which they foresaw, as the event proved, that they and the Spartans would be led to take part on opposite sides. By Diodorus⁴, the Phocians are described as authors of the rupture, by first attacking Thebes, and then calling in the Lacedæmonians to their assistance. In the same way, it is implied by Xenophon, in his usual indirect mode, that Sphodrias, the Spartan harmost of Thespis, was bribed by the Thebans to make his treacherous attempt on the Piræus.⁵

Origin of
the Sparto-
Theban
war.

Sphodrias.

¹ VI. v. 50. sqq.

² Thirlwall, vol. v. p. 133.; Grote, vol. x. p. 291.

³ III. v. 3.

⁴ XIV. 81. See Grote, vol. ix. p. 402.

⁵ v. iv. 20.

According to Diodorus¹, he acted by advice of Cleombrotus, his own commander-in-chief.

Thessalian
affairs.

Curious evidence of Xenophon's habitual suppression of Theban acts or enterprises, and also that the subsidiary notices of those suppressed are authentic, is furnished by himself, in his incidental allusions to the same events as to matters of general notoriety; allusions which are only intelligible by aid of those subsidiary notices. In the congress of Delphi, the negotiations are said² to have been broken off, because the Thebans would not consent to Messenia being dependent on Lacedæmon. In the sequel³ the Messenians are mentioned as part of the force opposed to the Spartans at Cromnus; and Pelopidas insists, as one of the terms of a general peace under discussion at Susa, that the independence of Messenia should be acknowledged.⁴ The point of all these allusions depends on the circumstance, concealed by Xenophon, that the virtual independence of Messenia was already established. The passage of Agesilaus through Thessaly before the battle of Coronea, is said⁵ by the Historian to have been opposed by the Larissæans, Pharsalians, and other tribes of that district, "allies of the Thebans." How the Thebans came by these allies, whom we know to have been not many months before vassals of Sparta, Xenophon does not inform us. But from other sources we learn, that they were the fruit of the Thessalian victories of Ismenias, suppressed by Xenophon. Similar allusions occur to the results of the equally suppressed Thessalian wars of Pelopidas and Epaminondas. After the congress of Delphi, a question

¹ xv. 29.

² vii. i. 27.

³ vii. iv. 27.

⁴ vii. i. 36.

⁵ Hell. iv. iii. 3.

having arisen between the Spartans and Athenians, now in alliance against Thebes, as to the best mode of employing an auxiliary force contributed by Dionysius of Syracuse, the Athenians are urgent that it should be sent to Thessaly to oppose the Thebans¹; in the war, namely, then waging by Pelopidas against Alexander of Pheræ, as described by Plutarch and Diodorus, but suppressed by Xenophon. Not long afterwards, on the last incursion of Epaminondas into Laconia, we find mentioned², as part of the Theban army, a force sent by the same Alexander and other Thessalian powers. Here we have a confirmation of Plutarch's account, of Alexander having been reduced to purchase peace from Thebes, on condition of his serving in her wars. Without the text of secondary writers, these allusions by Xenophon, to the interference or influence of Thebes in Thessalian politics, would be incomprehensible enigmas. The wilfulness of the suppression is the more evident in the case of this Thessalian potentate, from the marked attention which Xenophon bestows, and the long digression into which he wanders, on his affairs and those of his dynasty; always carefully avoiding any part of its history that tended to the honour of Thebes.

The exaggeration incident to the Historian's Spartomania, could hardly fail to involve him also in self-contradiction. In VII. ii. 2. all the Helots are described as having revolted after the battle of Leuctra. This statement is made in order to give effect to a eulogium on the little republic of Phlius, for its fidelity to Sparta in her disasters. In his previous narrative

The Helots
after Leuc-
tra.

¹ VII. i. 28.

² VII. v. 4.

of those disasters, where the object was to signalise the energy with which Sparta struggled against them, he tells us¹, that such was her confidence in the fidelity of these same Helots, that they were invited to serve in her army, and that in a very short space, the names of 6000 volunteers were enrolled.

Destruc-
tion of
Mantineæ.

In describing the siege and destruction of Mantinea by Agesipolis, and the obligation imposed on the inhabitants not to rebuild the destroyed city, but to dwell in scattered villages, Xenophon remarks, that the citizens were at first grieved for the loss of their houses, but that they soon came to prefer their new mode of life, on grounds which he assigns.² He does not attempt to reconcile with this account how, immediately after the power of Sparta was broken at Leuctra, the Mantineans united to a man in the reconstruction of their metropolis, in spite of the efforts of Agesilaus, by conciliation or intimidation, to prevent them.³

The treatment of Mantinea on this occasion has been condemned by impartial authorities⁴, as an unjustifiable breach of the lately concluded treaty of Antalcidas, by which Sparta had guaranteed political freedom to every Greek republic. Xenophon describes the whole affair in a tone of complacent satisfaction, as but an ordinary incident in Lacedæmonian policy.⁵ A like course was afterwards pursued, he informs us, with Phlius; and other authorities describe it as extended to other cases, and as having in fact given the finishing blow to any moral hold which Sparta still possessed on the

¹ VI. v. 28.

² v. ii. 7.

³ VI. v. 3.

⁴ Conf. Diodor. xv. 5. sq.; Isocrat. Didot, p. 42. sq.

⁵ v. ii.

good will of her former confederates.¹ That Xenophon, while here making the best of a bad cause, was not altogether blind to its rottenness, appears from his paradoxical attempt to prove that, practically at least, the outrage was beneficial to those whom it affected, and from the miserable jest with which he winds up his narrative, on "the lesson mankind 'had learnt, not to build a city on two sides of 'a running stream'"²; alluding to the stratagem by which Agesipolis obtained possession of the town. A bad joke is a common expedient with a sophistical pleader, for masking the poverty of a case or an argument. This is perhaps the most offensive passage in the Hellenica, being conceived in a spirit of vulgarity, as well as unmanly sarcasm against the victim of a brutal act of oppression.

8. Xenophon rarely allows any remarkable transaction in which Agesilaus was concerned, to pass without a few words of eulogistic commentary on what he considered the more excellent points of his character. But the examples adduced are for the most part of such a nature, as to convey to the unbiased mind an impression rather the reverse of favourable. We have already noticed the panegyric pronounced on his conduct at Coronea, for an act which it would have been discreditable in any brave soldier to have left unperformed. In the sequel of the same text he is the subject of another eulogy of a like questionable description: "After the victory, Agesilaus was informed that about eighty men of the 'beaten army had taken refuge in a neighbouring 'temple, and his officers inquired how they were to

Agesilaism
of Xeno-
phon.

Coronea.

¹ Grote, vol. x. p. 55.; Sievers, p. 151.

² v. ii. 7.

Death of
Agesipolis.

"be treated?" Agesilaus, who, "though severely wounded, was yet not unmindful of his duty to the gods, ordered them to be set free, and no injustice to be done them."¹ This order, leaving out of view modern notions of quarter to prisoners, did but enjoin what every devout pagan considered as an act of religious duty, or rather did but prohibit what in their eyes would have been an act of sacrilegious bloodshed. When Agesilaus hears of the premature death of his nephew and colleague Agesipolis, the Historian observes: that instead of being gratified, "as might have been expected, at the removal of a rival in office, he shed tears, and showed grief for his loss."² In the sequel the two royal kinsmen are described as having lived on the best terms, and Agesipolis as having conducted himself in the most respectful and affectionate manner towards his uncle and elder on the throne.³ Why then "it might have been expected," that Agesilaus would rejoice in the death of such a colleague, or why he should deserve credit for being differently affected, is not easy to comprehend, even by reference to the Spartan standard of moral sentiment. Had the young king's removal left the surviving monarch sole master of the throne, the case would have been simpler. But both Xenophon and Agesilaus knew well, that the result of the poor youth's death would be but to substitute in his place another rival king, possibly of a more troublesome temper.

Seizure of
the Cad-
mea.

The indulgent or even approving tone in which Xenophon chronicles actually base or dishonourable acts of his patron, is no less remarkable than his over-admiration for those of a creditable or indifferent tendency.

¹ IV. iii. 20.

² V. iii. 20.

³ Conf. Plutarch, Agesil. 20.

When the news arrived of the treacherous seizure of the Cadmea, "the Ephori, and the great body of the "citizens, were much offended with Phœbidas for having taken such a step without the sanction of the "government. Upon this Agesilaus remarked: that "if the act was disadvantageous to Sparta, its author "deserved to be punished; but if beneficial, he was, "according to old custom, justified in his stroke of "policy."¹ When in the sequel it became necessary for the republic to send an army into Bœotia, in support of their king's nefarious doctrine, he excused himself from the command on the pretext of his advanced age; the true reason of his holding back, says his panegyrist, "being, that he knew, if he were "to undertake it, people would say that Agesilaus, "by his support of the Theban tyrants, was involving the state in trouble. He therefore preferred "allowing them to manage matters in their own "way."² Here we have clear proof, that the feeling of the wiser and better part of the Spartan community was opposed to his policy in the transaction. The more reason is there to admire the complacency with which Xenophon notices this part of his conduct. For what more scandalous in a leading statesman than, after misguiding his countrymen, against their own better judgement, into unwise and dishonest measures, to evade, by so miserable a subterfuge, his share in the duty of helping her out of her difficulties! That this was not the first instance in which his policy had given just offence to the Lacedæmonian commonalty, appears from another passage of his Attic eulogist; where, after describing his invasion

¹ v. ii. 32.: conf. Plutarch, Agesil. 23.

² v. iv. 13.: conf. Plutarch, Agesil. 24.

Phlius.

of Phlius, with a view of forcing on that state an oligarchal government, he remarks, that Agesilaus had here also to contend with much adverse popular feeling: "many of the Lacedæmonians complaining that, in order to favour a few individuals, they were making a city of five thousand men their enemy."¹

Attempt
on the
Piræus.

The boldest act of Spartan political treachery, next to the affair of the Cadmea, was the attempt of Sphodrias on the Piræus, which helped to drive Athens into the Theban interest, at a moment when her alliance was of great importance to Lacedæmon. Agesilaus was not indeed a party to this outrage. But he did his best to increase the indignation which it produced throughout Greece, by shielding its author, under influences of a scandalous nature, from the sentence of death decreed against him by the Ephori. Here again, the circumstantiality with which Xenophon narrates this affair, shows that he considered the part taken in it by Agesilaus as rather creditable to him than otherwise.²

Dilemma
of Xeno-
phon.

The dilemma in which Xenophon was habitually placed, between his intuitive sense of right and wrong, and his self-imposed obligation to prove his own friends to be always in the right, is curiously illustrated by the few lines of pithy general commentary, which have been wrung from him by this fatal crisis of Lacedæmonian history, and which are the most remarkable passage of the kind in the Hellenica. In relating the seizure of the Cadmea, he neither expressly blames nor commends the course pursued. But the terms in which he describes it as having been vindicated by Agesilaus, are certainly

¹ v. iii. 16. : conf. Plut. Ages. 24.

² v. iv. 25. sqq.

conceived in a spirit of approbation rather than censure. A different tone is adopted, when the progress of events showed that the authors of the outrage were destined to be its principal victims :

“To the many proofs,” he remarks, “that might be adduced, from the history both of Hellenes and Barbarians, that the gods are not regardless of the perpetrators of impious acts, I will now add one from the events of this period. For the Lacedæmonians, who had never before been coerced by any human power, after having, in violation of their oaths to respect the autonomy of their fellow-republics, seized on the acropolis of Thebes, were, by the men of Thebes alone, signally punished for the wrong committed.”¹

This remarkable passage fully bears out our former observation, that according to a fundamental rule of Xenophon's judgement on Spartan affairs, although Lacedæmon might err, Agesilaus could do no wrong; and hence, even where error or crime was committed by his authority, against Lacedæmon alone or her citizens is the censure directed. The Historian's admission that, when the other Spartan councillors condemned the act of Phœbidas, and would assuredly, under better guidance, have disowned it, the prompt vindication of it by Agesilaus induced them to persevere, clearly marks him out as the real criminal, against whom, alone or in chief, the denunciation here so carefully limited to “the Lacedæmonians,” ought to have been directed.

It appears in fact, on Xenophon's own evidence, that Agesilaus was the author or abettor of all the principal acts of folly or iniquity committed by Sparta during this fatal period of her history. He seems to have been a man of a naturally kind heart and gene-

¹ v. iv. 1.

rous temper, an affectionate friend and a bountiful master, while his social intercourse was characterised by an outward liberality of sentiment and affability of demeanour, which his Laconian simplicity of habits rendered the more engaging. These qualities, with his genuine Spartan patriotism, his military prowess, and the success of his early campaigns, procured for him during the first part of his reign a powerful hold on the esteem of his fellow-citizens, which he maintained during the whole of his long life. But he displays none of the qualities of a truly great man; no comprehensive statesmanlike views, no powers of mental combination or foresight, no habits of self-control, no consistency of political action. His talents were in all respects such as qualify a man in high station to make a distinguished figure under prosperous circumstances, but not to guide the helm of the state in great emergencies, or sustain a bad cause against opponents, as formidable by their ability, as by the justice of their ends and the integrity of their conduct.

Agesilaus
and Epaminondas.

9. This is the man whom Xenophon holds up to the admiration of posterity, as his one standard model of excellence in Hellenic character. This is the man, in order to magnify whose commonplace qualities, he has insidiously libelled and vilified the two most distinguished patriots of his own or perhaps of any other age; who, by their combined wisdom, valour, and humanity, raised a naturally sluggish people from mediocrity, to that same ascendancy over the most gifted nation of the world, from which Agesilaus was so greatly instrumental in degrading Sparta. If it be admitted, what Xenophon himself would hardly have ventured to deny, that the characters of great men

are the noblest materials of history, and that one of the first obligations of a historian is to exhibit those characters in a true light, in themselves and in their relation to each other, Epaminondas and Pelopidas were assuredly the men of this age, whom the historian of its vicissitudes was bound to place in the front of his narrative. Xenophon therefore, in denuding them of their just meed of honour, must be pronounced a very grave defaulter to the highest duties of his office.

We must not however overlook that he has, at the eleventh hour, in describing¹ the last days of Epaminondas, rendered, or affected to render, a tribute of notice, it can hardly be called of respect, to the character of that illustrious man. For it is a most inadequate and disingenuous, as it is a tardy, sullen, and reluctant tribute. Its whole tone reveals the motive that inspired it, and which may, at the moment when it was written, have been thus mentally expressed by its author: "I cannot in decency close my narrative without a few special remarks on this extraordinary man; but I will say as little as possible, or in such terms, as may conduce more to the honour of my friends who so nobly struggled against his baneful influence, than to his own." What has been said is embodied in the form of a commentary on his last campaign in Peloponnesus.² It is limited to his military qualifications; and while consisting in great part of exceptional criticism, which assumes here and there a tone of bitter sarcasm, is yet sufficiently seasoned with faint praise to shed over the whole a certain colour of impartiality. The hollowness of its few complimentary passages becomes the more apparent,

¹ VII. v. 8. sqq.

² See Appendix N.

from the suppression, in the previous narrative, of the data on which they are, or ought to have been grounded. When, for example, he tells us that Epaminondas, in spite of the unexpected obstacles to his advance beyond Tegea, yet determined to proceed, "lest he should sully the former lustre of his name,"¹ we vainly attempt to learn from Xenophon what that former lustre may have been; even the name to which we now suddenly find it attached, having been first mentioned not many pages before, and that in connexion with one of the least successful of its owner's political undertakings.

Athenian
affairs.

Xenophon's account of the part taken by Athens, in these later vicissitudes of Greek federal war, while reflecting no less clearly his personal feelings, is more creditable to him both as a man and a historian, than his treatment of Thebes. It might have been expected that long alienation from his native republic, with a sense of the harshness of her conduct, would have fostered feelings of soreness and irritation, which would naturally find vent in a work embracing the contemporaneous history of this unkind or unjust country. Yet nowhere is there any trace of such feelings. He appears to take pleasure in recording transactions honourable to Athens, shows a lively interest in her welfare, sympathy with her misfortunes, and an indulgent spirit towards her failings. The first part of his narrative is chiefly devoted to her affairs. In the sequel those of Lacedæmon, partly owing to their own importance, partly to the author's more advanced Laconism, obtain the ascendant, and Athens is thrown comparatively into the

¹ VII. v. 9.

shade. But still there is none of that tendency, so largely manifested in the case of Thebes, to garble or suppress her honourable acts¹, or to magnify the achievements of Spartan at the expense of Athenian eminent men. We can here have no truer test of the relative warmth or coldness of the Historian's inclinations, than that formerly applied in the parallel instance of Sparta and Thebes. While the name of Epaminondas alone among Theban warriors, has been allowed a place in the Historian's narrative, as a counterpoise to those of some forty Lacedæmonians, those mentioned on the side of Athens during the same period, form a sum total little inferior in number, and superior in quality, to the Spartan catalogue. Nor does the honour bestowed on the deeds performed, appear to have been unfairly distributed between Spartans and Athenians. Several Athenian commanders, Iphicrates for example and Thrasybulus, are perhaps, next to Agesilaus, Xenophon's principal objects of military admiration. He enlarges with evident zest on the defeat by Iphicrates of the Amyclæan mora at Sicyon²; on that of Anaxibius by the same general at Byzantium³; on the successes of Thrasybulus at the Piræus⁴, not only against "the "Thirty" but their Spartan supporters, and on his subsequent achievements in the same Byzantine campaign.⁵ Conon, on the other hand, although his principal acts are not suppressed, is thrown so much into

Iphicrates.

Thrasybulus.

Conon.

¹ Xenophon describes the Athenians (III. v. 2.) as not partaking of the bribes by which the Thebans, Corinthians, and Argives were induced to league against Sparta. Pausanias and Plutarch represent them as having also received a share of the money. Paus. III. 9. 4.; Plut. Ages. 15.

² IV. v. 7. 11. sqq.

⁴ II. iv.

³ IV. viii. 31. sq. : conf. VI. ii. 27. sqq.

⁵ IV. viii. 25. sqq.

the background, as to warrant the suspicion that he was to Xenophon an object of personal disfavour.¹

Delinea-
tion of cha-
racter.

The *Hellenica* possesses little of that interest which arises from delineation of character; the greatest men of the age, Pelopidas, Epaminondas, Conon, being thrown into the background, while the elaborate portrait of Agesilaus is a panegyric caricature. Among the sketches of less eminent personages, those with pretensions to ethic or dramatic effect are to be found chiefly in the first part of the narrative, before the appearance of Agesilaus on the scene. The levity and mendacity of Theramenes, and the gloomy bloodthirsty tyranny of Critias, are well brought out in the debate which resulted in the death of the former², and on other occasions where Critias takes the lead, in the subsequent stages of the narrative.

Style of the
Hellenica.

The Style of the *Hellenica* in the narrower sense, partakes both of the merits and the defects noticed in our general remarks on Xenophon's art of composition. The favourable features are however predominant. The defects are chiefly observable in what we have defined as the second division of the work; where the author, under the sway of his personal reminiscences, exchanging the office of historian for that of popular storyteller, retails the camp or court gossip of his Spartan patrons, or of the petty Asiatic

¹ His great naval victory of Cnidus (iv. iii. 10.) is treated very cursorily in comparison with the contemporaneous triumphs of Agesilaus. That of Chabrias at Naxos (v. iv. 61.) is also mentioned but slightly. See Thirlwall, vol. v. p. 58.; Grote, x. p. 176.; Sievers, p. 220. The able tactics by which Diodorus describes Chabrias as having shortly before outgeneraled Agesilaus in Boeotia, are also overlooked by Xenophon. Grote, x. p. 173.; Sievers, p. 205.

² II. iii. 15. sqq.

princes with whom they are brought into contact. Much of this anecdotal matter is in the form of Dialogue. dialogue. In this department of composition Xenophon is at no time very successful, and the specimens in this portion of his text are apt to degenerate into trivial commonplace. The subjoined conversation held by Agesilaus, successively with two of his Asiatic allies, is a fair sample of some others :

“ AG. Tell me, Spithridates, would you not be willing to give your daughter in marriage to Otys ? SP. More willing no doubt than he, as lord of a rich principality, would be to accept her at the hands of a banished man such as I am. . . . AG. Tell me, Otys, do you consider Spithridates a man of good family ? OT. Of as good as any in Persia. AG. Have you ever observed his son, what a handsome youth he is ? OT. How should I not, having supped in company with him last evening ? AG. They say that he has a daughter still handsomer than the son. OT. By Jupiter, she is indeed handsome ! AG. Let me then advise you as your friend to espouse this fair maiden. For what more agreeable thing for a man than the possession of a beautiful wife ? she being also the daughter of a man of such noble birth”¹

Passages of a like tenor are frequent in the latter parts of the Hellenica. The first or Attic portion is free from them.

10. The defects of the dialogue are well compensated by the merit of the speeches. Speeches. In no classical history has greater judgement been shown in the management of these passages, than in the Hellenica. The orations are to the point, well argued, of appropriate length, varied, often with much ethic spirit, to suit the characters of the speakers, and seasoned with playful allusion or lively sarcasm. While free from metaphysical casuistry, they are not deficient at times in logical subtlety. Several expedients have

¹ IV. i. 4. sqq.

been successfully employed, to relieve by dramatic effect the formality of rhetorical harangues. Instead of the whole argument bearing on the question at issue being compressed into one or two elaborate orations, as if by professional pleaders pitted against each other, the proceedings frequently assume the form of free debate, partly by the introduction of a third speaker, partly by brief interpellations on the continuity of the speeches, in the mode of altercation or retort; partly by statements interposed in the Historian's own words, of what other members of the assembly, or the audience at large, said or felt.¹ Occasional passages of these addresses display an eloquence so much above the Historian's ordinary style, that taken by themselves they might rank as citations from Demosthenes or Æschines, rather than Xenophon.² In two instances, following the example of Herodotus, he has availed himself of the rhetorical form of address for historical purposes, by placing in the mouths of the Acanthian and Pharsalian envoys to Lacedæmon, retrospective narratives of the transactions which led to their mission.³

Descriptions.

In his descriptions of tragic or striking scenes, Xenophon is most effective where he appears least ambitious of producing effect. The best passages of the kind are where, overlooking details, he vividly sketches off the more salient features of objects. As an example may be quoted the scene before the gate of Corinth, where Agesilaus, engaged in solemnising something akin to a Roman triumph, with much of the supercilious pomp of a Roman emperor, is suddenly informed of the destruction, by the same ad-

¹ II. iii. 24. sqq., VI. v. 33. sqq. 37., VII. i. 2. sqq. 12 sqq.

² Conf. II. iv. 20. sqq., iii. 43.

³ V. ii. 12. sqq., VI. i. 4.

versary over whom he was exulting, of the best portion of the army to which he owed his vaunted successes.¹ The account of the battle of the Piræus, where Thrasybulus defeated the Thirty tyrants, is centred with highly dramatic effect, on a single striking incident, the devotion and death of the prophet on the patriot side :

“Thrasybulus, on finishing his address to the men, faced towards the enemy, and remained tranquil at his post ; the augur having enjoined that no attack should be made, until some one on their own side had been either killed or wounded. ‘Then, ‘and not till then,’ said he, ‘we will lead you on to what, if I ‘rightly forebode, will be victory to you but death to me.’ Nor was he mistaken. For as they stood to their arms, suddenly, as if by an impulse of destiny, darting forward on the hostile phalanx, he was slain ; and lies buried on the neighbouring bank of the Cephissus. The victory remained with those whom he left behind, and who drove the enemy routed from the field.”²

The last scene of the life of Theramenes is also a fine piece of joint dramatic and descriptive composition.³

His efforts on the other hand to infuse poetical fire into his descriptions, by strong language or studied figures of speech, are apt to result in hyperbole or bombast. As a specimen may be taken his ferociously enthusiastic account of the conquest of the Lecheum by the Lacedæmonians :

“The act of killing was here indeed made easy, the gods having given over to their hands such a work, as they had never probably so much as ventured to pray for. How indeed could it be considered as anything but a gift of the gods, that such a mass of enemies should, as passive victims, yield themselves up to destruction, terrified, panic-stricken, exposed on all sides, incapable of

¹ IV. v. 6.² II. iv. 18. sq.³ II. iii. 50. sqq.

resistance. So great was the slaughter, so small the space for the slain, that as men are accustomed to see piles of corn, wood, stones, so they might here have beheld piles of dead bodies."¹

The hurried accumulation of terms by which it is here attempted to enhance the power of the description, is a favourite figure of language with Xenophon.² His ordinary descriptions of battles, while distinct in their main features, and showing an accurate knowledge of the subject, are, as has been seen in the cases of Coronea, Corinth, and Leuctra, apt to be marred, both in their historical and their poetical effect, by his attempts to distort facts to the advantage of his favourite warriors.

Speculative remarks.

Xenophon, like Thucydides, is sparing of speculative remarks on the events described. That the most elaborate passage of this nature in the *Hellenica*, should be bestowed on the conduct of Epaminondas in his last Peloponnesian campaign, is a proof, both of his real sense of the grandeur of the subject which wrung from him this tardy commentary, and of the sinister purpose with which it has been drawn up. His more concise expressions of opinion are apt to assume a quaint egotistical tone, little consistent with the dignity of historical style.³

Chronology of the *Hellenica*.

In the first two books of the *Hellenica*, or rather in the portion of them which forms the supplement to Thucydides, Xenophon continues the chronological method of that historian, by years and seasons of the

¹ IV. iv. 12.

² Commonly without connecting particles. Conf. *Hellen.* II. iv. 33, IV. iii. 19.; *Anab.* III. i. 29., IV. v. 25. 31., V. iii. 9., VI. vi. 1.; *Cyrop.* VII. i. 38.; *Cyneg.* v. 18. 30., VI. 5. The identity of this feature of Xenophontean mannerism, as exemplified in his several works, is one of the strongest, among the minor internal evidences of the genuine authorship of the *Anabasis*.

³ II. iii. 56., V. iii. 7., VI. ii. 32. 39., VI. v. 51., VII. v. 8.

“in the previous narrative.” The expression “logos,” above rendered “narrative,” here refers, it need scarcely be remarked, not, as common in Herodotus, to some separate part or division, but to the whole text in its integrity.¹

¹ See further Appendix P.

CHAP. XIV.

THE CYROPÆDIA.

1. EPITOME OF THE TEXT.—2. THE CYROPÆDIA A HISTORICAL ROMANCE. CHARACTER OF ITS HERO. ITS HISTORICAL ELEMENT, AS TESTED BY OTHER AUTHORITIES. CYRUS.—3. CYAXARES. CRÆSUS. OTHER SECONDARY PERSONS. GEOGRAPHICAL ELEMENT. PRIMITIVE PERSIAN CONSTITUTION. MILITARY SYSTEM.—4. MISCELLANEOUS CUSTOMS. RELIGIOUS WORSHIP. PERSIAN ART OF WAR, COMPARED WITH THAT OF SPARTA. COMPOSITION AND STYLE OF THE WORK. THEIR MERITS. THEIR DEFECTS.—5. DIALOGUE. ITS DIFFUSENESS. "HOMERIC COMMONPLACE."—6. DIFFUSENESS OF THE NARRATIVE. ITS ROMANTIC ELEMENT. EPISODE OF ABRADATAS AND PANTHEA.—7. JUDGED BY THE STANDARD OF MODERN LOVE-ROMANCE. OTHER PATHETIC PASSAGES. DESCRIPTIONS OF BATTLES. SPEECHES.—8. DELINEATION OF CHARACTER. CYRUS. HIS FACETIOUS HUMOUR. HIS BOYHOOD. HIS DEATH.—9. CYAXARES. OTHER SECONDARY CHARACTERS. EPILOGUE OF THE CYROPÆDIA, HOW FAR GENUINE.

BOOK I.

Epitome of
the text.

1. CYRUS, a prince endowed with all the noblest gifts of nature, was the offspring of Cambyses king of Persia, and Mandane, daughter of Astyages king of Media.¹

On completing, with his twelfth year, his earlier course of education in the primitive Persian fashion, he accompanies his mother on a visit to the Median court. Here he remains five years, and acquires a proficiency in other accomplishments, especially hunting and horsemanship. On his first essay in arms he distinguishes himself in a battle with the Assyrians. After having, by his many admirable qualities, won the love and esteem of the Median nation, he returns home, untainted by their luxurious habits, while profiting by their more advanced civilisation.² During the following years he completes his course of training in the arts of war and government, under the sage direction of his father Cambyses.³

About the time of his attaining man's estate, Astyages dies, and is succeeded by his son Cyaxares, uncle of Cyrus. Soon

¹ i. ii.

² iii. iv.

³ v.

after this event the king of Assyria, whose empire already extended over a great part of Central Asia, collects a powerful army for the conquest of Media. Cyaxares applies for aid to his brother-in-law Cambyses, who sends the whole force of his kingdom under the command of Cyrus.¹

BOOKS II. III.

The composition and equipment of each contending army are described, with the improvements made by Cyrus in the organisation of his Persian force.² Ambassadors arrive with proposals from the king of India, to act as mediator in maintaining peace between the belligerent powers. The offer is accepted by Cyaxares, and the Indian envoys proceed to Babylon, to follow out the negotiation at the Assyrian court.³

The king of Armenia, a vassal of Cyaxares, presuming on the Assyrian war, as a favourable opportunity for asserting his independence, refuses his customary payment of tribute. He is speedily reduced to submission by Cyrus, whose generous treatment secures his future fidelity.⁴

The Chaldeans, a warlike people on the Armenian frontier, are also first subdued and then conciliated by Cyrus, to whose army they contribute a stipendary force. A mission is sent to the king of India to solicit a loan in aid of the war.⁵

Cyrus, with the combined Medo-Persian army, anticipates the movements of the Assyrians, advances to meet them on the frontier, and after a skilful course of strategic manœuvres, with greatly inferior numbers, attacks and defeats them. The remains of the vanquished host abandon their intrenched camp and retreat⁶ on Babylon.

BOOK IV.

Cyaxares, jealous of his nephew's success and popularity, declines following up the victory, pleading the necessity of repose for the troops, and caution in invading so mighty an empire with so limited a force. He sanctions, however, the prosecution of the war by Cyrus, and grants permission to his Median warriors to serve as volunteers; when the greater part determine to follow the Persian prince's fortunes.⁷

The Hyrcanians, a numerous frontier tribe of the Assyrian

vi.

² II. i.—iii.³ II. iv. 1. sqq⁴ II. iv. 12. sqq., III. i.⁵ III. ii.⁶ III. iii. 6. sqq.⁷ i.

empire, discontented with their own sovereign, renounce their allegiance, and dispatch messengers to the Persian head-quarters with offers of military service. Their overtures are accepted, and their troops, deserting in a body to the camp of Cyrus, act as guides into the hostile territory. Another action ensues, in which the Assyrians are again routed, with loss of their baggage, treasure, and provisions.¹

Cyrus establishes an improved system of commissariat for his army, and organises a corps of Persian cavalry, his native troops having hitherto consisted of foot soldiers only.²

Cyaxares, more and more alarmed by the increasing power and influence of his nephew, sends an order for his Median warriors forthwith to return home. This order is not complied with, on grounds explained by Cyrus in letters of apology to his uncle. He at the same time asks and obtains reinforcements from Cambyzes.³

Gobryas, a powerful subject of the Assyrian king, by whom his only son had been slain from envy of the youth's superior skill in the chase, deserts to the camp of Cyrus, and makes over to him a strong fortress which had been entrusted to his keeping, together with the surrounding territory. He is rewarded with the Prince's favour and confidence.⁴

Book V.

Cyrus commits to the care of Araspas, a Median officer of rank, a beautiful captive named Panthea, wife of Abradatas of Susa, a distinguished subject of the Assyrian king.⁵

After ravaging unopposed the Assyrian territory up to the walls of Babylon, Cyrus for the present postpones the attack on the city.⁶

Gadatas, another noble Assyrian, who had, like Gobryas, been personally injured by his sovereign, follows the example of Gobryas in making over to Cyrus his territory and strongholds. Soon afterwards two other Assyrian provinces, the Sacæ and Cadusii, declare for the Medes, and send a large accession of force to the invaders. The Cadusian division before Babylon, rashly exposing itself to a sudden attack from the garrison, is beaten and driven back with heavy loss.⁷

¹ ii. : conf. iv.

² ii. 34. sqq., iii.

³ v. 8 sqq. : conf. v. i. 19.

⁴ vi. : conf. v. ii. sqq.

⁵ i. sq.

⁶ iii.

⁷ iii. 8.—iv.

By mutual agreement between Cyrus and the Assyrian king, each undertakes, during the war, to abstain from ravaging the lands or plundering the peasantry of the provinces friendly to his opponent.¹

Cyrus returns from Babylon to the Median frontier, where, in a conference with Cyaxares, he explains to his uncle's satisfaction his late act of disobedience.²

BOOK VI.

In a council of Medo-Persian chiefs it is resolved to prosecute the war with vigour. The troops retire for the present into winter quarters, where Cyrus causes them to be practised in martial exercises. He provides the army for the ensuing campaign with scythe-armed chariots, and other engines of war.

Araspas, becoming enamoured of Panthea, attempts to corrupt her virtue. She appeals for protection to Cyrus, who, reproving him for his conduct, sends him as a spy into the hostile camp. Cyrus, on being assured by Panthea that her husband, like Gobryas and Gadatas, had grounds of offence against his sovereign, invites him to the camp. The invitation is accepted; and Abradatas henceforward attaches himself to the fortunes, and enjoys the confidence of Cyrus.³

Ambassadors arrive from India with the desired contribution to the cost of the war; the sovereign of that country being now convinced of the justice of the Persian cause. They also announce that the Assyrian monarch had collected, and placed under the command of Crœsus king of Lydia, a force greatly superior to any hitherto brought into the field, comprising the armies of Lydia, Egypt, Phœnicia, Arabia, and other friendly or tributary states.⁴

BOOK VII.

On the renewal of active field operations, the Assyrian army is once more routed in a decisive battle, fought near Sardis, the Lydian metropolis. The only officer of distinction slain on the Persian side is Abradatas, whose wife Panthea destroys herself over his body.⁵

Crœsus takes refuge in Sardis, which city, after a short siege, he surrenders, with himself and the garrison, to the conqueror. The captive monarch is generously treated by Cyrus, and retained on an honourable footing about his person.⁶

¹ iv. 24. sqq.

² v.

³ i.

⁴ ii. sqq.

⁵ i. iii.

⁶ ii.

The other states of Asia Minor are rapidly subdued. Cyrus then marches against Babylon, of which he obtains possession by draining off the waters of the Euphrates, and passing with his army over the dry bed of the river into the city.¹

BOOK VIII.

Establishing his court and central seat of government at Babylon, Cyrus adopts measures for consolidating his dominions, organising his offices of state and court ceremonial, and rewarding his companions in arms.² After a solemn religious thanksgiving for the divine favour with which he had been blessed, he visits his uncle Cyaxares and his father Cambyses. The former bestows on him his daughter in marriage, and appoints him heir to the throne of Media.

The conquered countries are distributed into satrapies, for the local government of which Cyrus provides by many wise institutions.

At a later period of his reign, Egypt, and several new provinces of Southern and Eastern Asia, are added to his former conquests.³

When already far advanced in years, forewarned by a vision that his life was drawing to a close, he assembled around him his sons and principal officers of state; and after many sage advices concerning their future conduct, and the administration of his empire after his death, tranquilly expired in their presence. But his precepts, with the example of wisdom and virtue which he had bequeathed, were but little appreciated by his successors; and under their misrule, the primitive purity and integrity of the Persian character gave place to license and corruption, and his salutary laws and institutions were forgotten or despised.⁴

The Cyropædia
a Historical
romance.

2. The Cyropædia has been commonly assigned by modern critics, to the branch of composition entitled in our own day Historical romance; and this is perhaps as near a definition of its character, as our own stock of such technical terms supplies. Of romance indeed in the familiar sense the work contains but little. The main narrative is devoted to affairs of

¹ iv. v.² i. ii.³ iii.—vi.⁴ vii.—viii.

state, civil and military. The illustrative materials, which engross the greater part of the text, consist of disquisitions on the art of war, on political government, and social economy.¹ Of those chivalrous adventures, or displays of passion and feeling, which form the staple ingredients of modern romantic story, the *Cyropædia* is comparatively barren. Its whole amount of such matter reduces itself to a single subordinate love-episode, the amorous interest of which would scarcely rank under the head of romantic in the modern sense.

The main scope of the work is to present the reader with the author's idea of a perfect system of monarchical government. This system he has figured as created or matured, by a no less perfect monarch and military commander; with whose life and influence it is so closely identified, that as it grew with his youth and manhood, with his death it begins to decay. He is represented, not only as perfect in wisdom and administrative talent, as the most valiant of soldiers, the ablest of generals, the most eloquent of orators, but as endowed with every moral and physical excellence; exempt from every vice or weakness; distinguished by delicacy of mind, beauty of person, muscular strength and activity. He is a generous friend, a merciful enemy; proof against female fascination, and against the influence of pride, anger, malice, and all other sensual or unseemly passions. Nor is this

Character
of its hero.

¹ The antients do not seem to have had any distinctive appellation for works of this kind, owing probably to their rarity in classical times.

The hypothesis of Gellius, that the *Cyropædia* was written by Xenophon in opposition to the *Republic* of Plato, seems to be fanciful. There is more plausibility in the notion of Diogenes Laërtius (in *Plat.*) that Plato, in the third book of the *Laws* (p. 694.), may have alluded to the *Cyropædia*. See Schneider ad *Cyrop.* i. i. 1.

Utopian perfection confined to his character; it extends to the success with which his undertakings are crowned. His life is a series not only of noble and virtuous actions unsullied by any crime, but of prosperous enterprises unalloyed by a single reverse. His wars are never wantonly undertaken, commonly forced on him by foreign aggression; and he conquers but to bestow those blessings of good government, which render his rule more acceptable to the subdued nations than that of their legitimate sovereign.

The person selected as the original of this faultless picture of royalty is the elder Cyrus, a prince who, by reference to more authentic data, though not deficient in great qualities, was not certainly distinguished by any such extraordinary combination of them, or by any similar exemption from defects.

There is this distinction between the *Cyropædia* and other classical works in which truth and fiction are blended, that its materials, to whatever extent they may be unhistorical, are never actually fabulous, in the sense of superhuman or preternatural. Even those facts or events which may on historical grounds be set aside as false, are yet such as might possibly have been true. The task of the critic, therefore, is not to separate mythology from history, but to distinguish what portion of the whole mass of apparently historical events is to be considered as true, what portion as fictitious. The same remark applies to the persons introduced. We have nowhere to deal with gods, or other supernatural agencies, but to distinguish among the whole number of human heroes, those who ever actually existed in real life.

Its
historical
element,

The amount of historical truth which can on critical grounds be admitted to exist in the *Cyropædia*,

reduces itself to little more than the one or two elementary facts on which the main narrative hinges: that Cyrus son of Cambyses, king of Persia, conquered and consolidated, on the narrow basis of his native territory, an empire comprising the principal regions of Western and Central Asia. In regard to the mode in which this series of events is brought about, the Cyropædia differs from other more accredited authorities, including Xenophon himself in his strictly historical works. Herodotus and Ctesias, who among Greek historians in the proper sense, have treated most fully of the life of Cyrus, while at variance with each other on many points, agree in describing Media as the earliest of his conquests. In the Cyropædia this country is represented as from the first an ally and confederate of Persia in all her undertakings; as forming, conjointly with herself, the foundation of independent monarchy on which the conquered states were afterwards reared into a single imperial fabric. The Cyropædia agrees with Herodotus, in describing Mandane, daughter of Astyages, as wife of Cambyses and mother of Cyrus. But the circumstances under which the marriage is contracted, and the heir born and educated, differ widely in the two legends. Ctesias on the other hand, makes Cyrus not the son, but the husband, of the Median king's daughter, espoused by him after the subjugation of her father's territory. Both these traditions, in so far as regards their genealogical data, are embodied in the Cyropædia; where Cyrus, himself the son of Mandane, secured his succession to the throne of Media, by marrying late in life his first cousin, daughter of his uncle Cyaxares, the then reigning sovereign of that country.

as tested
by other
authorities.

Cyrus.

The discrepancies between these several accounts being so great, and the ingredient of pure mythology, from which that of Xenophon is free, being so copious in those of Herodotus and Ctesias, it were the less fair to Xenophon to assume, from the concurrence of the two rival authorities on any one or more points, that their version is necessarily right and that of the *Cyropædia* wrong. Herodotus himself assures us¹, that he knew not less than four traditions regarding the birth and early destinies of Cyrus; and that he had selected the one which seemed to him the most probable. Ctesias has preferred another. Xenophon therefore, in adopting a third, might be equally entitled to assert its claim to credibility. He has however forfeited that privilege by having, in his own properly historical work the *Anabasis*², concurred with Herodotus and Ctesias, in representing the Median empire as conquered by Cyrus. We have thus his own testimony that, even assuming the different story told in the *Cyropædia* to be one of the four varieties of Oriental tradition, it has not been selected by him on account of its historical truth, but of its better adaptation to the spirit of his romance.

The *Cyropædia* differs also from other more strictly historical accounts, in regard to the extent of its hero's conquests. It represents³ all the provinces comprehended in the Persian empire at the epoch of its greatest power, including Egypt and India, as having been acquired, and transmitted to his heirs by Cyrus. It is however certain that Egypt was first reduced by his son Cambyses; and the small portion of India, if any, that Persia ever possessed, was, if we may trust

¹ I. 95.² III. iv. 8. 11, 12.³ I. i. 4., VIII. vi. 20.

Herodotus, acquired by Darius.¹ Regarding the conqueror's death, Xenophon differs from both Herodotus and Ctesias, in representing him as dying tranquilly in his own palace surrounded by his family. Both the rival Græco-Persian historians² describe him as defeated and slain in an invasion of the Scythian territory. Xenophon agrees with Herodotus and Ctesias, in making his hero leave behind him two sons. The eldest by all three authors is named Cambyzes; his brother, by Herodotus Smerdis, by Ctesias and Xenophon Tanaoxares.

3. Cyaxares the uncle of Cyrus is a personage unknown to authentic history. The only other character possessing in common with Cyrus himself, his father, mother, and grandfather, claim to historical reality, is Cræsus king of Lydia. In respect to his affairs, Xenophon is also at issue with Herodotus and all other classical authorities. By these Cræsus is represented as a first cousin, friend, and ally of Astyages king of Media. On the usurpation of that kingdom by Cyrus, alarmed by the fate of his kinsman, he marches against the conqueror, is defeated, and his own empire annexed, as Media had previously been, to that of Persia. In the *Cyropædia* Cræsus, far from being either relative or ally of the Median monarch, is the principal confederate of the Assyrian emperor in his struggles against the combined Perso-Median power, is declared commander-in-chief of his armies, and when, in that capacity, beaten in battle, pays the forfeit of his own liberty and crown. Herodotus³ describes, and doubtless truly, the whole of Asia Minor west of Halys as subject to the kings of Lydia at this

Cyaxares.

Cræsus.

¹ IV. 44.² Herod. I. 214.; Ctes. frag. xxix. (6.), xxxvi. Didot.³ I. 6. sqq.

time. Xenophon makes the other tribes of that district, even on the immediate frontier of Lydia proper, independent powers, whose alliance the king of Assyria courts like that of Cræsus himself, by diplomatic missions.¹

Other
secondary
persons.

With these examples of Xenophon's little regard for historical truth in the substance of the narrative, the less reliance can be placed on its details. Such are the revolt from Media, and speedy reconquest, of the vassal state of Armenia; such the successive defections to the Persian interest, of Assyrian provinces and chiefs; of the Chaldæans, Hyrcanians, Sacæ, and Cadusii; of Gobryas, Gadatas, and Abardatas. If we except, in fact, a few battles and sieges, these defections constitute the sum total of what can properly be called historical incident in the book, and by their uniform sameness, illustrate the poverty of its author's inventive genius. Xenophon seems indirectly to decline vouching for the historical identity of several of his principal characters, by suppressing their names. Thus the king of Assyria receives no other denomination than that of "the Assyrian." The king of Armenia is "the Armenian;" his wife, "Armenia;" the chiefs of the Hyrcanians and Cadusians are, in like manner, "the Hyrcanian" and "Cadusian." Persian and Assyrian names and persons are also confounded. Gobryas, who in authentic history is the chief of one of the illustrious native Persian families, is in the *Cyropædia* an Assyrian deserter to the Persian camp. The Oriental geography of the *Anabasis*, has been shown by modern research to be reasonably correct, and does credit, on the whole, to the observation, the memory, and the veracity of the

Geographical
element.

¹ I. v. 3.

author. That of the Cyropædia, whether from ignorance or carelessness is continually at fault. The Hyrcanians on the south-eastern shore of the Caspian sea, hence also called the Hyrcanian sea, are, on Xenophon's map, neighbours and subjects of the Assyrians¹; from whom they were separated, in the real geography of Asia, by the whole breadth of the Median empire. They are also described as a small people; being in truth one of the most extended of Central Asia. Their neighbours the Cadusians are, with equal disregard of topographical propriety, characterised by the Hyrcanians themselves as vassals of Assyria, and as a very numerous race²; being but a petty tribe as compared with the Hyrcanians. The Bactrians, whose frontier was about 800 miles distant from Assyria, and could only be reached from that country by a march across Persia or Media, are represented³ as having been subjected to a hostile inroad by the Assyrian king, just before Assyria itself was invaded by the Perso-Median army. The Chaldæans, on the frontiers of Armenia, are described as in habitual intercourse with India, and serving as mercenaries in the army of the Indian monarch⁴; from the nearest point of whose territory their own was really distant about 1500 miles. This strange anomaly, and the no less anomalous notices of the "Indian envoys," who wander to and fro, in the capacity of peacemakers between the contending powers, have led modern commentators, in their anxiety to save Xenophon's geographical consistency, to look, as vainly as unnecessarily, for some tribe of Indians in the neighbourhood of the Black sea.

It is difficult to believe that Xenophon could have

¹ IV. ii. 1.² V. ii. 25.³ I. v. 2.⁴ III. ii. 25. seq.

been as ignorant of Asiatic geography as these details, if held to represent his real opinions, would imply. It would almost appear as if, in order to impart "romantic" effect to his narrative, he had anticipated the license of his fellow-romancers in our own age, and setting geographical consistency at nought, had conferred on his heroes unlimited powers of roaming in quest of adventures, from any one to any other corner of the earth, which suited his or their convenience. In one instance he seems to write, or to fancy himself writing, in the person of some Asiatic chronicler, rather than of a Greek man of science. After defining (somewhat vaguely) the empire of Cyrus when finally constituted, as bounded by the Erythræan sea to the east, the Euxine to the north, Egypt and Cyprus to the west, and Æthiopia to the south, he adds¹: "the regions beyond these limits," (inclusive therefore of Greece and all Europe, with the richer parts of Africa), "are either seas, arid deserts, or otherwise little adapted, owing to excess "of heat or of cold, for human habitation." This description would be appropriate in an extract from some popular Median work of geography; but reads strangely in the page of an accomplished Greek scholar and traveller.

Primitive
Persian
constitution.

Herodotus describes Persia in the time of Cambyses father of Cyrus, as a vassal state of Media²; and Cambyses as a chieftain inferior in dignity to the Median nobles of the higher class. Nor does he allude to any material difference between the Persian form of government, and that common in other dependencies of the Median empire. Xenophon on the other hand, represents Persia as an independent state, and its go-

¹ VIII. vi. 21.

² I. 107.

vernment as a limited monarchy¹; the power of the king being shared with or restricted by, a privileged order of citizens. This body he describes as similar to the Spartan aristocracy, and the titles applied to them, Coequals or Peers, are the same as, or equivalent to, those by which in his other works he habitually designates the Spartiates.² The national system of education, which according to him formed among the Persians as among the Spartans, an essential element of state policy, and the influence of which on his hero's character was a main source of his subsequent greatness, is also an idealised counterpart of that of Lacedæmon.³ It combines all the better parts of the Spartan discipline without its defects. It trains to habits of temperance, hardihood, and contempt of danger; to civil and military subordination, and reverence for age and virtue; without sanctioning the duplicity, ferocity, and other vices of the Lyncurgen system.

It is not certainly probable, that so enlightened a form of mixed monarchical and aristocratical polity, should have been matured among a rude people in the heart of Central Asia; still less that it should have presented so striking a resemblance to the Socratic theory and the Lacedæmonian practice, of which Xenophon was an admirer. As the Cyropædia therefore is the only authority for its existence, the other Greek writers who notice it having all apparently borrowed from Xenophon, and as his account, if not actually contradicted, is not confirmed by Herodotus, no great weight can attach to it. At the same time, as several of those general features of government and manners which it describes, can be recognised among

¹ I. iii. 18., v. 4., II. ii. 22.² ὅμοιοι, ὁμότῃμοι³ I. ii. alibi.

other hardy races of mountaineers, Dorian, Celtic, or Teutonic, their existence to a like extent among the Persians, has been not inappropriately assumed by Xenophon, as the source of that ascendancy which the nation, under the auspices of its gifted ruler, so speedily acquired over all other Asiatic races. On the establishment, in the sequel, of his vast empire, this primitive constitution is, with equal propriety, represented as giving place to an unlimited monarchy, under his mild and beneficent sway.¹

Military
system.

A like degree of theoretical probability is observable in the Historian's account of the Persian army, when first placed under the command of Cyrus. It is described as already preeminent among those of Asia for valour and discipline, but of limited number, and deficient in military equipment. One thousand alone of the 31,000 men which it comprised, the Peers or Coequals above mentioned, were Hoplites or heavy-armed infantry; the rest were archers or other light troops.² It had neither cavalry, baggage train, nor other requisites for aggressive warfare. Such a force being of a properly defensive nature, adapted for hill-fighting and home campaigning alone, is in good keeping with the habits of a secluded mountain people, who had hitherto been content with maintaining their own independence, careless of foreign enterprise. Hence, when their alliance with the Medes placed them at the head of a great military undertaking, on a remote theatre of war, an entire change in their organisation is effected. The thousand men-at-arms are augmented to 31,000, supported by the just proportion of light troops; with cavalry, armed cha-

¹ VIII. i. sqq.

² I. v. 5.

riots, and all the requisites for prolonged marches and field movements.¹

4. Among the miscellaneous customs described in the *Cyropædia*, there occur no doubt many genuine traits of Persian life. But there are also not a few, which we know from authentic sources not to have been Persian, and the greater part of which are very palpably Greek; while other characteristic Persian customs, mentioned by trustworthy authors, are overlooked. The want of originality in many of Xenophon's notices, appears from a comparison with the concise summary given by Herodotus, assuredly from good sources², of the peculiarities in which the Persians chiefly differed both from the Greeks and other nations. While few of these are mentioned in the *Cyropædia*, a great part of those described in its text are unnoticed by Herodotus. According to the latter, the only deities worshipped by the Persians were the elements; Jupiter, as symbolic of the celestial sphere;

Miscellaneous
customs.

Religious
worship.

¹ I. v. 5., II. i. 9., I. vi. 10., IV. iii. 4. Forty thousand infantry and ten thousand cavalry are afterwards added to the 31,000 hoplites; making up in all 81,000 (v. v. 3., VI. ii. 7.), besides chariot-drivers and military engineers. Yet in I. ii. 15. it is said that the whole Persian male population amounted to only 120,000. Xenophon has here forgotten himself, as in some other similar instances. The commendations so frequently and cordially bestowed on the Persians, for the frugality and abstemiousness of their diet (I. ii. 8. 16., III. 4., IV. v. 4., v. ii. 16., VIII. viii. 15.), are completely vitiated by II. ii. 3. sqq., VIII. ii. 3. The statement in VIII. i. 23., that the priesthood of the Magi was first instituted by Cyrus after the conquest of Babylon, is at variance with IV. v. 14., VII. v. 57. The statement in VIII. viii. 9. that the Persians took but one meal a day, is disproved by VI. iv. 1. compared with VII. i. 1. From a comparison of v. iii. 27., 28., and iv. 4. 6. 7., it appears that Cyrus performed in three days a journey which had shortly before been stated to be impossible in less than seven. The Persians are represented at one time as taking their meals in a sitting posture (VIII. iv. 2. sqq.); at others, as reclining at table in the Greek fashion (II. ii. 3. 28.).

² I. 131. sqq. : conf. Strab. p. 732. sqq.

the Sun and Moon; the Earth, Fire, Water, and the Winds. Several of the Hellenic names by which, according to Greek custom, Oriental deities are designated in the *Cyropædia*, such as Zeus, Hera, Vesta, may reasonably be assumed to indicate members of the same cosmogonical pantheon described by Herodotus. Xenophon however attributes in general terms to the Persians, much of the proper Greek polytheistic system. His warriors invoke Mars¹ on entering battle, and the local gods and heroes of the several countries through which they march, on crossing their frontier.² They talk of the gods as subject to the influence of sensual love towards mortal heroines.³ They habitually designate their own royal family as of divine blood, and as sprung from the same Hellenic hero Perseus⁴, to whom Greek popular tradition traced its origin. Herodotus⁵ denies that the Persians offered burnt sacrifice or libations in their religious rites. Xenophon⁶ represents them as sacrificing their holocausts and pouring their libations, in pure Greek fashion, even to the precise number of goblets enjoined by Hellenic usage for particular occasions.⁷ They also practise the Greek art of divination in its various forms.⁸ Xenophon everywhere dwells on the frugality of their meals, and the sobriety of their habits.⁹ Herodotus describes them as fond to excess of delicate viands, and as ridiculing the frugal fare of the Greeks; as greatly addicted to wine, and as under an obligation to intoxicate

¹ VII. i. 26.² II. i. 1., III. iii. 21. sqq. alibi.³ VI. i. 36.⁴ I. ii. 1., IV. i. 24., VII. ii. 24.⁵ I. 132.⁶ VIII. iii. 24., III. iii. 21. sqq., III. iii. 40., VII. i. 1.⁷ II. iii. 1. : conf. Schneid. ad loc.⁸ II. iv. 18., 19. : conf. I. vi. 2. 23. 44. sq., VI. iv. 12. sq.⁹ I. ii. 8. 16., I. iii. 4—10., V. ii. 16., IV. v. 1. sq., VIII. i. 36.

themselves on certain occasions, as a matter of public business.¹ The account given of their system of education also differs in each author.² Both mention their strict regard for truth, and their adoption of the Median dress. To the licentious polygamy which Herodotus³, doubtless with all justice, describes as inveterate in Persia, there is no allusion in the *Cyropædia*. While not one of the principal heroes is represented as the husband of more than one wife, the small amount of romantic interest which the author imparts to his narrative, hinges on the devoted attachment of spouses to their one object of connubial affection. As Herodotus alleges the several traits of character here mentioned to be consistent with his own knowledge, considering his unblemished reputation for truthfulness, and Xenophon's slender sense of that obligation, little weight can attach to the authority of the latter on points where they differ. That the military system attributed to Cyrus in the *Cyropædia* is in great part borrowed from Lacedæmon, appears, as well from the general correspondence of the two, as from the identity of particular usages. Such are the inauguration of battles or other hazardous enterprises by crowning the head⁴; the chanting of the pæan before commencing the attack⁵; the formation of the front rank of the pha-

Persian art
of war
compared
with that
of Sparta.

¹ I. 133.

² *Cyrop.* I. ii.; Herodot. I. 136.

³ I. 135.: conf. Strabo, p. 733. Other Persian peculiarities pointed out by Herodotus (I. 133. sqq.), but unnoticed by Xenophon, are their excessive reverence for, and sumptuous modes of celebrating their birth-days; their custom of distinguishing rank by forms of salutation, and of estimating human character by geographical position; their veneration for running streams, and peculiar modes of manifesting that feeling.

⁴ III. iii. 40. 42.: conf. *Anab.* IV. iii. 17.; *De Lac. Rep.* XIII. 8.; *Plutarch*, *Lycurg.* 22.

⁵ III. iii. 58., VII. i. 9.: conf. IV. i. 6.

lanx exclusively of officers¹; the preference of red as the colour of military costume²; the frequent changes of station in open campaigning.³ Several of the more complicated field manœuvres, described by Xenophon in his *Lacedæmonian Polity* as peculiar to the Spartan art of war, and beyond the ability of less practised Greek armies⁴, are also represented as habitually executed, in all their extent and subtlety, by the troops of Cyrus.⁵

Composi-
tion and
style:
their
merits

The merits of the *Cyropædia* as a literary composition, apart from its pretensions as a historical record, are: its unity of epic action; the elegance and purity of its style; the harmonious flow and liquid perspicuity of its language, attributes in which it surpasses all the other productions of its author; the just and noble sentiments in which it abounds; the lessons of wisdom which it inculcates; and its many graphic descriptions of events, and traits of character. The defects of the work are: its meagreness and monotony of historical substance, and poverty of incident; the consequent great disproportion between the narrative and the illustrative portions of the text; and the diffuseness of every part of it, principal subject and episode, narrative and description, set speech and familiar dialogue. That the *Cyropædia*, while the most bulky of Xenophon's historical works, is the most deficient in historical material, may be seen from our epitome of its contents, which, though not less ample in proportion to that material, occupies less space by nearly a half than the corresponding

and
defects.

¹ III. iii. 57. : conf. Xenoph. de Rep. Lac. XI. 5. ; Hipparch. II. 6.

² VII. i. 2. : conf. VI. iv. 1. ; Xenoph. de Rep. Lac. XI. 3. ; Agesil. II. 7.

³ III. iii. 23. : conf. De Rep. Lac. XII. 5.

⁴ De Laced. Rep. XI.

⁵ Cyrop. VI. iii. 21. sqq., VII. i. 5. sqq.

abstract of the Hellenica. The principal action consists of two military campaigns, comprising three battles, two sieges, and the usual proportion of subordinate operations. Of dramatic plot the work is barren. The hero marches and fights steadily on, without a serious check to his career of victory. The episodes are all of one character, the successive defections to Cyrus, of Assyrian subjects, dissatisfied with their own sovereign. They are in fact mere duplicates of each other. The action in the proper sense may also be said to be all on one side. The Medo-Persian camp or court is the only stage; Cyrus, his family, and adherents, the only actors. Except one short address by "the Assyrian" to his army, no member of the adverse party is ever introduced on the foreground, unless in the capacity of a prisoner or a deserter. This skeleton of main narrative is fleshed up to its existing corpulence, by descriptions of military manœuvres and camp convivialities; disquisitions on the art of war in all its branches; on speculative points of moral and social economy; on the character and habits of Cyrus, his system of government, its provincial divisions, and public institutions.

These illustrative details are all more or less tainted with the defect above noticed of excessive verbosity; a defect which is but little relieved by the usual expedient of distributing portions of the text, in the form of oration or dialogue, among the principal actors. Cyrus is everywhere the chief orator; but the secondary characters are also charged, each according to his share in the action, with their proper share of superfluous loquacity. The most trivial incident of everyday life is described, at as great

Rhetorical
element.

length and with as solemn gravity, as the most momentous undertaking. The plainest course of policy, with all its probabilities of success or failure, the most evident motives of conduct, in all their shades of merit or demerit, are analysed, censured, or vindicated, with a like superabundance of equally self-evident argument and illustration. The subjects treated being themselves of a uniform character, their treatment is no less remarkable for monotony than prolixity. The same lessons of political government and military tactics, the same exhortations to valour and discipline, recur from time to time, under so little variety of form, that the novelty of effect scarcely amounts to what we experience on meeting an old friend, in a dress slightly differing from what he wore when we were last in his company.

Dialogue.

5. We have already, in treating of Xenophon's other works, noticed his undue tendency to embody in the form of dialogue, statements which, in so far as worth expressing, would be better expressed in the mode of direct narrative. The spirit of colloquial discourse, in literary composition as in real life, depends, first on the subject discussed possessing in itself a certain interest, secondly on its being treated in a spirited manner. Of this twofold principle Xenophon seems to have had no clear perception. He seems to have thought, that nothing more was required, to impart lively effect to the discussion of the most commonplace matter, than that it should be discussed closely and carefully, in the form of question and answer, by two or more of the persons concerned.

Its diffuseness.

This conversational prolixity and the general disproportion between the narrative and the didactic

element of the book, are jointly exemplified in the journey of Cyrus, in company with his father, to take the command of the Median army, and in his dialogue with his uncle Cyaxares on arrival. The journey, while not marked by a single incident, occupies near forty pages of the text, descriptive of conversations by the way between the two travellers.

“Having beguiled the route with these discourses,” the narrative proceeds,¹ “they were cheered as they approached the Median frontier, by the auspicious flight of an eagle on the right hand. After offering prayers to the gods and heroes who preside over the Persian territory, graciously to bless and prosper their course, they crossed the border. On reaching the other side, they offered up prayers to the gods who preside over the Median territory, graciously to bless and prosper their arrival within its bounds. Having performed these duties, and embraced each other, as it was natural they should, Cambyses returned home, and Cyrus continued his journey to the Median capital, the residence of Cyaxares. On reaching the Median capital, the residence of Cyaxares, the two princes first embraced each other, as it was natural they should, and then Cyaxares asked Cyrus what was the strength of the army which he brought with him. Cyrus replied, ‘There are the 30,000 whom you have already taken into your pay, and there are others on their way, of the class called Peers, who have never yet served abroad.’ ‘How many of these are there?’ said Cyaxares. ‘Their number,’ said Cyrus, ‘when you hear it, may not perhaps altogether satisfy you; but you must know that these so called Peers, few as they are, easily maintain authority over all the other Persians. But do you really need them; or has it been a false alarm, and will the enemy not come after all?’ ‘Come he will, by Jupiter,’ said Cyaxares, ‘and in great force.’ ‘How has this been ascertained?’ ‘On the information of many, arriving by different roads, but who all tell the same story.’ ‘We must then prepare to engage them?’ ‘As a matter of necessity,’ said Cyaxares. ‘Were it not well then,’ rejoined Cyrus, ‘that you should let me know, if you are yourself informed, what is the strength of the invader, and also what our own; in order that, being instructed on both points, we may take

¹ II. i. 1.

counsel as to our conduct of the war.' 'Listen to me then,' said Cyaxares : 'Cressus of Lydia, it is said, will bring into the field 10,000 horse, and more than 40,000 archers and other light troops.'¹ . . . 'You calculate therefore,' said Cyrus, 'our cavalry at less than a third, and our infantry at about one half, of the corresponding force of the enemy.' 'How so?' said Cyaxares; 'do you consider as a trifle the remaining Persians whom you promise to bring?' 'We will consider presently,' said Cyrus, 'how far we may or may not require more men; but let me hear now, what is the customary mode of fighting in each army.' 'Nearly the same with all; for both their men and ours are either cavalry, archers, or other light troops.' 'The battle therefore with men so armed, will necessarily be one of missile weapons?' 'Necessarily,' said Cyaxares. 'If so,' remarked Cyrus, 'the victory must be on the side of numbers; for the few are likely to be much more speedily slain or disabled by the many, than the many by the few.' 'Such being the case, O Cyrus, what better resource have we than to send to the Persians, reminding them, that should any disaster happen to the Medes, they will be joint sufferers, and soliciting an increased amount of force?' 'But you surely know,' said Cyrus, 'that even were all the fighting men in Persia to come forth, we should not outnumber our adversaries.' 'What better expedient then can you suggest?' 'Had I the means,' said Cyrus, 'I would with all speed provide the whole of my Persians with the same arms as are borne by my thousand Peers; with a strong breastplate, and shield for their left arm, and a sword or scimitar for the right; and if you can furnish these, you will render our charge on the enemy so effective, that they will find it more advisable to run than to hold their ground.'"

By any writer, free from the spirit of conversational garrulity by which Xenophon was possessed in composing the *Cyropædia*, the substance of this tedious circumlocution would have been summed up as follows:

Cyrus learns from Cyaxares, that the hostile army, then about to take the field, and comprising Assyrians proper, Lydians, Phrygians, Cappadocians, Æolian Greeks, &c., outnumbered his own in the ratio of more than two to one, and was composed, like

¹ We omit the ensuing "Homeric catalogue" of the component parts of each army.

his own, chiefly of light-armed troops. In order therefore to make up by weight of arms for deficiency of numbers, he decides on equipping the whole of his thirty thousand light infantry as Hoplites or men-at-arms.

Every part of the work abounds in passages of the same kind, through which the reader is obliged to plod, page after page, in order to possess himself of the few grains of real information which they supply.

From the first part of this extract it will be seen, that Xenophon, among other expedients for imparting epic effect to his narrative, has resorted to the Homeric one of reproducing notices of familiar objects or occurrences, in the same commonplace forms of expression. This practice he has at times carried to a Homeric excess, which in a prose work savours strongly of affectation, or even of absurdity. Not only do the Persian warriors embrace each other, and propitiate their gods and heroes, in certain prescribed forms, expressed by certain conventional phrases, but they are sent to bed¹, sit down to dinner, rise from table², and perform other acts of human necessity, with much of the same epic ceremony as Agamemnon and Nestor in the *Iliad*, or the suitors in the *Odyssey*. Where so many other less important matters are discussed at so great length, it was also but reasonable that the question of the dinner hour, or the quantity and quality of the food, should be honoured, at times, with something more than a mere formal notice. After the storming of the Assyrian camp, the cavalry and light troops, consisting chiefly of foreign allies, are sent in pursuit of the fugitive host. Cyrus and

"Homeric
common-
place."

¹ II. iii. 1., iv. 22. 26. 30., III. i. 43., ii. 2., iii. 28., v. iii. 35., iv. 19., vi. iii. 37., vii. iii. 1., III. i. 41., III. ii. 31., vi. i. 1. alibi.

² III. ii. 11., iii. 42., 43., v. iv. 21., 22., v. 38. sqq., vi. iii. 7. 8. 37. alibi.

his Persian men-at-arms remain to guard the newly occupied position. As the pursuing detachments were long absent, the question arose, whether the Persians should go to dinner without them or await their return; upon which point Cyrus delivers himself to the following effect:

“My friends, we are, I know, at liberty, if we think fit, to go to dinner at once, in the absence of our allies, and enjoy the very complete repast both in meat and drink which has been provided for us. But it does not appear to me that you would be so much benefited even by so good a dinner, as by showing your concern for your allies; nor should we derive from the best of cheer, as much strength, as we should add to our cause by encouraging their zeal for its support. Were we, while they are risking their lives in the pursuit of our enemies, to seem so regardless of their comfort as to sit down to table before hearing how it has fared with them, I fear our conduct might be deemed dishonourable, and might weaken our interest by alienating our friends. But if we prove our anxiety that those who are now labouring and suffering for the common good, should, on their return, be well provided for, our own meal, I feel sure, will afford us greater pleasure, than were we at once to gratify our appetites. You will further consider, that even were we not withheld by respect for them, we are hardly ourselves as yet entitled to our fill either of food or liquor; the work we have in hand being not yet complete, and still demanding all our attention. . . . It seems to me therefore, my friends, that it would better become us, for the present, to be content with such a moderate amount of meat and drink, as would neither produce drowsiness nor intoxication,” &c.¹

The absurdity of all this is the more glaring, from the pains taken, in the sequel, to impress on the reader the more than Spartan indifference of the Persian warriors to the pleasures of the table²; and their voluntary restriction of their diet, even when guests at a board covered with delicacies, to the most frugal fare.

¹ IV. ii. 38. sqq.

² IV. v. 4.

6. It is on the approach of some great battle, or other momentous crisis of affairs, that the superfluous matter is accumulated to greatest excess, and in the most provoking manner. We feel as if we should never get at the point. The same speeches recur over and over again, in slightly varied form; the same descriptions of the most obvious things; the same long dialogues about nothing; the same sacrifices to the gods; the same exhortations to the men, and advices to the officers. Attention may be directed to the part of the narrative preceding the last great battle between the contending powers. The preliminaries to this event are diluted through some fifty pages of the text. While Cyrus is preparing to break up his winter quarters and take the field, after extensive improvements¹ in the organisation of his forces, fully detailed in the previous text, word is brought by the "Indian envoys," that the hostile army under Cræsus is already in motion; and the nations of which it is composed are again enumerated. The account of its numbers spreads alarm in the camp.² Cyrus therefore assembles the troops; and, with other advices, recapitulates, for their comfort, the improvements (formerly described) in their own body.³ It is then resolved that no time must be lost in advancing to meet the foe.⁴ But before setting out, he announces that the enemy is still upwards of fifteen days' journey distant; and an elaborate lecture ensues on the several branches of military economy, commissariat, pioneering, carpentry, cookery, essential to the progress of an army on a long march; just as if, after campaigning during the previous

Diffuse-
ness of the
narrative.

¹ VI. i. 26. sqq., 48. sqq., ii. 4. sqq.

³ VI. ii. 14. sqq.

² VI. ii. 9.

⁴ II. 24.

year across the length and breadth of Central Asia, they had never before heard of such things. Minute instructions are given as to the requisite stores of bread, wine, flour, meal, fresh water, and other eatable and potable articles to be laid in for a twenty days' march; on the art of economising wine by admixture of water; on the provision of handmills for grinding corn; of baking apparatus; of spare belts, straps, and thongs, for mending harness; of saws, planes, axes, and other tools for mechanical purposes; of grinding-stones, hones, strops, for sharpening those tools; of spare timbers, for mending chariots and other wheel carriages.¹ Such details could hardly be tolerable in classical composition, even in the mouth of a chief commissary giving directions to his subordinates, and are purely burlesque in the oration of a mighty king and commander-in-chief to his assembled army. How it happened that Cyrus, or his biographer, should have previously overlooked these requisites for renewing the campaign; or how, when the thought struck him, they could possibly have been got ready in the course of a few hours (for the army seems to have marched immediately after the speech), the Historian does not explain. Then follows a technical description of the order of march, still as if it were the first yet performed. At length the two armies are brought into contact; the enemy's outposts are within sight; and we begin to hope that the crisis has arrived; but we have still much preliminary matter to wade through. After a dialogue of the usual diffuse commonplace between Cyrus and some captured stragglers, his own favourite spy Araspas returns from the hostile

¹ VI. ii. 25. sqq.

camp, and gives a second edition of the "Indian envoys' " report of the Assyrian force, with a description of its line of battle.¹ The Persian plan of tactics is then arranged, and the field orders are issued in a series of exhortations, separately addressed by Cyrus in person to each of the principal officers of different services; not omitting the chiefs of the baggage train, those of the women's waggon train; of the camels, and of each detachment of troops appointed to escort or support these several bodies.² Another morning is occupied with sacrificing, and dining, and description, and dialogue; and after another long exhortation from Cyrus to his generals, in support or recapitulation of his previous exhortations, he dismisses them to their posts in the line of battle.³ Now at least we expect that the end is come; but it is still only the beginning of the end. The attack does not take place until after a further interval, represented by some seven or eight additional pages, in which Cyrus again dines, drinks, and distributes meat and drink to those of his soldiers who appear to stand most in need of it; again offers prayer and libation; holds several more consultations on the points already discussed, and on affairs in general; and delivers himself of numerous other shorter exhortations to officers and men, in which duty he continues engaged with unremitting zeal and loquacity, up to the actual moment of attack.⁴

The element of romance, in the narrower sense, or chivalrous love adventure, contained in the *Cyropædia*, is comprised almost exclusively in the episode

Its
romantic
element.

¹ VI. iii. 12. sqq.

³ VII. i. 1.

² VI. iii. 21—35.

⁴ VII. i. 22.

of Abradatas and Panthea, an outline of which is here subjoined: ¹

Episode
of Abra-
datas
and Pan-
thea.

Panthea, the most beautiful woman of the age, wife of Abradatas of Susa, a powerful subject of the Assyrian king, is taken by the Persians in the storming of the hostile camp, her husband being then absent on a mission to Bactria. She is selected, on account of her rank and beauty, for the special solace of Cyrus in his hours of relaxation. The prince's stoical temperament renders the sanctity of her marriage vow safe in his guardianship. Foreseeing that her captivity, and his generous conduct towards her, may hereafter be turned to political account, he commits her to the care of Araspas, one of his favourite officers, to be treated with the honour befitting her station. The danger to which Araspas might be exposed in the execution of his trust gives occasion for a discussion between him and Cyrus, on the antagonistic powers of sexual passion and stoical continence; in the course of which Araspas expresses his contempt for all amorous affection, and for all who yield to its seductions. Cyrus intimates his doubts; but leaves the issue to the test of experience. Araspas, as no modern reader of romance can have failed to anticipate, becomes desperately enamoured of Panthea. Foiled in an attempt to seduce her, he threatens violence. She complains to Cyrus; who more amused by the foolish predicament in which the self-confidence of the culprit had involved him, than offended by his breach of trust, treats his fault with indulgence; and as the best security for the future, sends him on a secret mission to the Assyrian camp. Panthea informs her protector, that her husband entertains no friendly feeling towards his own sovereign, who had himself conceived designs against her honour; and on her suggestion, a message is sent to Abradatas, inviting him to transfer his allegiance to Cyrus. Apprised of the generous treatment of his wife, he passes over to the Persian camp with a thousand men. He is there reunited to Panthea, and admitted to a high place in the esteem of Cyrus, which he continues to enjoy until his death in the last great battle against his former master. Touching descriptions are given of the parting scenes between Panthea and her husband prior to the action, and of her grief for his death. Cyrus, sympathising with the bereaved princess, unites with her in paying the last honours to his remains. On his approaching the bier, and grasping the hand

¹ IV. vi. 11., v. i. 2, sqq., vi. i. 31. sqq., iv. 2. sqq., vii. iii.

of his deceased friend, it comes away from the arm, the wrist bone having been severed by a wound. He delivers the hand to Panthea, who refits it to the arm. As the body is about to be consigned to the grave, Panthea stabs herself, and dies with her head resting on the bosom of her beloved. The remains of the devoted pair are entombed under a single lofty monument. At its foot are still seen the humbler graves of three favourite eunuchs, who slew themselves by the side of their mistress.

7. This narrative was highly esteemed by antient critics¹ for tenderness and pathos, but is less well adapted to modern taste in romance. The amorous sentiment on which it is founded, matrimonial affection, while forming, owing to causes considered in another place², the chief source of interest in antient love adventure, is little esteemed, scarcely recognised as legitimate, in the modern romance or novel. The episode possesses however the attraction of being the earliest specimen of a prose love story in Greek classical literature. To ingenuity of plot it has no pretension. Those complicated lovers' crosses, jealousies, persecutions, now so indispensable in amorous fiction, are altogether wanting. The captivity of the heroine, while attended with no present hardship, proves the immediate source of future happiness to herself and her husband. In most other stories of the kind, and there are numbers closely similar in fable and in history, the strong point of interest is the passion of the victor for the

Judged by
the
standard of
modern
love
romance.

¹ Hermog. De form. Orat. p. 396. ed. Porti; Plutarch, Non posse suavi vivi, &c. p. 1093.

² Vol. II. p. 234. sqq. That Xenophon's sense of the amorous pathetic was, like that of Homer, limited to the matrimonial relations between the sexes, appears from the few other incidents of the kind in the Cyropædia. Such are the dialogue between Tigranes of Armenia and his wife, on their restoration to each other; and the apostrophe by Croesus of Lydia to his conjugal happiness, in his interview with Cyrus. III. i. 36., VII. ii. 28.

captive lady, followed, either by his importunities and her heroic resistance, or by his generous sacrifice of his feelings to his sense of moral duty or regard for her happiness. The character of Cyrus gave no room for any such complication; and the motive by which Xenophon represents him to have been guided, that of keeping the princess in good condition, as an instrument for promoting his political schemes, imparts a prosaic turn to his share in the adventure.¹ The only real calamity that afflicts the constant couple, is one from which no matrimonial bliss is exempt, separation by death; and the suicide of the survivor is but a trite, as it is to modern taste an offensive expedient, for escaping the sorrows of widowhood. The pathetic scenes contain touching passages; but are most of them marred by some defect of management, proving that Xenophon, while not by nature a poet, had studied the art in the school of Euripides, rather than that of Homer or Sophocles. The tears of Panthea, after arming her husband for the battle, and her effort to conceal her emotion, though not original, are fine images, and finely expressed. But this burst of tenderness ought, as in the *Iliad*, to have closed the interview; to have accompanied the final farewell. Xenophon's inveterate turn for amplification superadds several pages of formal leave-taking, vows, and speeches, before the lovers are parted for ever. When at last Abradatas drives off in his chariot, her running after it and kissing the panel of the vehicle, as a last salute to its owner, is

¹ v. i. 17. The consignment by Cyrus of the custody of a beautiful woman to a lively young courtier, with unlimited access to her person, seems an obvious impropriety, whether with reference to antient Oriental, or to modern European custom.

a poor conceit. Still worse is the incident of the amputated hand, which seems to be paraphrased from the wild Egyptian legend of the Treasury of Rhampsinitus.¹ The suicide scene, down to the moment of the heroine's death, is well worked up; but the subsequent restriction of her share in the honour of self-immolation to but a fourth of the whole, the other three parts being allotted to her eunuchs, if it does not actually bring the catastrophe within the bounds of the ludicrous, removes it beyond those of the sublime.

This episode has the further defect, of uncongeniality with the main body of the narrative. If amorous romance was to form an element of the work, it ought to have been interwoven in some more natural manner with the main action, and the destinies of some one of the principal heroes. The introduction of these two secondary personages, for no other purpose than to act, by a side current of adventure, the part of poetical lovers, among a dramatic company of so very prosaic a character, and the alternate chequerings of lovers' tears and complaints with statistical and military disquisitions, have an incongruous effect.

The most touching and natural picture of wounded domestic affection, and one of the most eloquent passages in the *Cyropædia*, is the description given by Gobryas, of the murder of his son by the Assyrian tyrant, and of the effect produced by the calamity on his own feelings and prospects in life.²

Other
pathetic
passages.

Xenophon exhibits as little fertility of invention in the martial, as in the amorous branch of romantic description. In his imaginary battles we miss that graphic reality, which animates the real engagements

Descrip-
tion of
battles.

¹ Herodot. II. 121.

² IV. vi. 2. sqq.

of the *Hellenica* or the *Anabasis*. The *Cyropædia* is, in fact, as compared with those two works, a continual illustration of the difference between the art of describing well what a man himself has seen, and the talent of conceiving and conveying to others vivid impressions of fictitious events. Its battle pieces, mixed up as they are with commentaries on technical points of military science, are laboured and artificial. When on the other hand, the issue is made to depend rather on hand to hand valour than generalship, Xenophon's attempts to dramatise (as in the subjoined passage) the more striking incidents of a battle field, the shout, the charge, the collision, have more of bombast than Homeric fire:

"The word having passed through the ranks, Cyrus sang forth the customary pæan, the whole army joining in chorus, with pious devotion and loud voices. . . . After the pæan was ended, the Persian peers, advancing steadily, bright in aspect, well marshaled, looking one to the other, each calling by name, now his neighbour in the ranks, now his rear-rank man, and repeating from time to time, 'Come on gallant friends, come on brave fellows,' encouraged each other to press forward; while those in the rear, hearing their voices, responded by cries to the front ranks to lead on valiantly; and the whole army was full of zeal for Cyrus, of emulation, energy, boldness, exhortation, discretion, obedience; all which, it may be conceived, was most terrible to the enemy. . . . When they had advanced within the range of weapons, Cyrus called out: 'My brave warriors, now let each man show what he is, by quickening his step, and urge his neighbour to do the like.' As this injunction passed along the line, some, in their eagerness and rage, and ardour for the conflict, began to run, when the whole phalanx followed at the same pace, and Cyrus himself, forgetting the prescribed march step, led the charge, shouting, 'Who will follow, who is valiant, who strikes down the first enemy?' and all the others, hearing this and taking up his words, also shouted, 'Who will follow, who is valiant?' As the Persians advanced in this manner, their adversaries, unable to stand the shock, turned and fled."¹

¹ III. iii. 58.

Where Xenophon found the original of this description, or whether he had any in view, may be a question. But neither his own notices of real battles, nor those by other contemporary authors, warrant the belief that such displays of disorderly and loquacious valour could have been tolerated, in any army so thoroughly disciplined in the Spartan style as he describes the army of Cyrus to have been. His object may possibly have been, to idealise the tumultuous ardour with which, in his own age, the Persian column made its attack, as compared with the steady advance of the Lacedæmonian phalanx.

Of the speeches properly so called, the greater part Speeches. are spoken by Cyrus, and on subjects affording little scope for eloquence. The few that occur on topics of more general interest are also, with rare exceptions, solemn and monotonous. The dialogue, with much that is tedious or trivial, also comprises, where the debate assumes a graver turn, what are on the whole the most agreeable specimens of rhetorical style. Such are the valedictory discourses, in which Cambyzes imparts to Cyrus on entering life the benefit of his own past experience. These passages, while in better keeping no doubt with the porticoes of the Lyceum than the palace hall of an Asiatic prince, are yet in a singularly pleasing, as well as sound and instructive style of paternal admonition.

8. For genuine portraiture of character little scope Delineation of character. was afforded, in a work founded on the principle of investing semibarbarous chiefs with the attributes of Greek statesmen and Socratic philosophers.¹ Cyrus Cyrus.

¹ As examples of pure Socratic doctrines, placed in the mouths of Cyrus, Cambyzes, and other primitive Persian heroes, compare *Cyrop.* i. vi. 5. sq.; *Memor. Socr.* i. i. 9. : *Cyrop.* i. vi. 12. sq.; *Memor.* iii. i.

himself, as the type of a perfect social system, is a character which, while it does not exist in real life, is proverbially insipid in romance. He is however not only the ruler and father of his people, but their familiar friend and companion. He not only prescribes their duties, but promotes their amusements, and contributes his share to the sportive jest of their convivial meetings. Even a more skilful master of the comic art than Xenophon, might have had difficulty in making jocose humour sit easily on Cyrus. But it is difficult to understand how any writer of ordinary judgement, in his efforts to enliven the gravity of his model hero, could have placed in his mouth the contemptible nonsense of which he is occasionally made to deliver himself. In an entertainment given to his principal officers after the conquest of Babylon, the conversation turning on matrimony:

His facetious
humour.

"Whenever," said Cyrus,¹ "any one of my friends thinks of taking wife, let him apply to me, and he will soon discover how able I am to help him." "And if," said Gobryas, "one of us wants a husband for his daughter, to whom is he to apply?" "To me," said Cyrus, "in that case also, for I am singularly well skilled in this art." "What art?" said Chrysantas. "The art of suiting wives and husbands to each other." "Tell me then, by the gods," said Chrysantas, "what sort of a wife would you consider best suited for me." "In the first place," said Cyrus, "you would need a little wife, because you are yourself a little man; and were you to marry a tall woman, and were desirous of kissing her in a standing posture, you would be obliged to spring up, as the little dogs do." "You are right there," said Chrysantas, "for I am in truth but a

5. sqq. : Cyrop. I. vi. 21.; Memor. III. iii. 9., ix. 11. : Cyrop. I. vi. 22.; Memor. I. vii. 1., II. vi. 39. : Cyrop. I. vi. 27.; Memor. III. i. 6. : Cyrop. v. i. 16.; Memor. I. iii. 13. : Cyrop. VI. iii. 25. sqq.; Memor. III. i. 7. sqq. : Cyrop. VII. v. 75.; Memor. I. ii. 19.

¹ VIII. iv. 17. sqq.

bad jumper." "In the next place," continued Cyrus, "you would require a snubnosed wife." "Why so?" "Because you are yourself hooknosed, and you must see at once that hook and snub will best fit each other." "Do you not also think that, for a man who like me has just eaten a good supper, a supperless wife would be the best?"

The prince's reply to this question, while not less puerile than his previous sallies, is also offensively obscene. Xenophon seems here himself to be conscious of the discreditable light in which he exhibits his hero. For in the sequel of the dialogue he introduces one of the speakers alluding, in a not ineffective vein of indirect sarcasm, both to the poverty of the royal jester's wit, and to the coldness of his temperament:¹

"'Can you also tell us,' continued Chrysantas, 'what sort of a wife would best suit the frigid humour of our king?' At this both Cyrus and the others laughed heartily; when Hystaspes remarked: 'On one account, O Cyrus, above all others, I envy you your royal station.' 'What is that?' said Cyrus. 'That frigid as may be your wit, you always find laughers.' 'Then you would readily, no doubt, pay a good sum to secure for yourself the character of a witty man with the lady whom you wish to please.' In this way were they accustomed to jest with each other."

The liveliest part of the hero's biography, is the account of his boyhood. The scenes at the court of Media, are singularly pleasing sketches of domestic manners, whether Oriental or Greek. The all-engrossing interest of the kind-hearted old Astyages in his little grandson; the matronly serenity and motherly anxiety of Mandane; the playful humour and boyish precocity of the future conqueror, are characteristic and well sustained. The convivial dialogue of the

His boyhood.

¹ VIII. iv. 22.

family circle at Ecbatana, is also in better taste than that of the Babylonian banqueting-hall. Nor is the exuberant license of animal spirits ascribed at this early age to Cyrus, inconsistent, as might on first view appear, with his subsequent character: it being certain, that both in our own species, and in the analogous case of various animals, such excess of vivacity in early youth, is often the forerunner of placid gravity in mature age. There is hence much ethic spirit in the description of the ingenuous boy's growing consciousness of the propriety of assuming a more staid demeanour as he approaches manhood.¹

Next to its commencement, the part of the *Cyropædia* which exhibits its hero in the most favourable light, is its close. His parting address to his family is the finest passage in the book, and the most creditable specimen of Xenophon's philosophy or of his rhetoric, in his collective works. That highest doctrine of natural religion, the immortality of the soul, is here inculcated in a practical form, and with a persuasive eloquence, better calculated to bring it home to the minds of the mass of mankind, than volumes of elaborate argument. After dwelling on the mutual obligations of the two sons whom he leaves behind, he proceeds:²

His death-bed.

"I adjure you then, by the gods of our fathers, and as you value my own happiness, that you continue to love and cherish one another. For let it be far from you to imagine, that when I have passed the term of this human existence, I shall cease to live. Even in this life my soul has never been visible to you, and your knowledge of its existence is derived from its acts alone. But you

¹ I. iv. 4.

² VIII. vii. 17. The greater part of this address has been transferred by Cicero to his own text, in his tracts *De Senectute* and *De Legibus*. Schneid. ad loc.

cannot have failed to observe the terrors with which the spirits of injured men inspire guilty consciences, or the avenging dæmons which they send to torment the impious. Nor can you surely believe, that the custom of paying honour to men after their death would have become so inveterate, if their spirits had no perception of those honours. For myself, I never could be persuaded that the soul lives only so long as it dwells in a perishable body, but dies in the moment of its emancipation from that body. When I see that even mortal bodies, while the soul remains within them, are preserved alive, how can I believe that the soul itself, when separated from a lifeless body, becomes lifeless? It is when the spirit is purified from material contact, that its own animation ought to be most perfect. On the dissolution of a human frame, the return of every portion of it to its kindred element, is manifest to the eye, except that of the soul, which has never yet been seen either present here or departing elsewhere. Remember also, that nothing in the life of man so nearly resembles death as sleep; yet it is in sleep that the soul is in its most spiritual state, and as most free from present contamination, is best qualified to penetrate futurity. If then it be, as I have supposed, that the soul in death is merely released from the body, let your reverence for my soul induce you to obey my dying commands."

Thus far the argument, in the spirit of antient metaphysics, is conclusive. But at this point Xenophon, with his characteristic levity, suddenly shifts his ground, and makes his hero virtually demolish his whole system of morality, by admitting that the religious dogma on which he had taken such pains to found it, may after all be fallacious; and by suggesting in its stead another, which, however valuable in support of the first, and no less beautifully expressed, is, as it stands alone, both worthless and self-contradictory:

"But even," he continues¹, "if it be not so, if the soul, being inseparable from the body, dies with it, yet let your veneration for the gods, who, themselves eternal, omniscient, and all powerful, maintain and preserve the order of the universe, in all its boundless

¹ VIII. vii. 22.

extent and beauty, imperturbable, imperishable, unfading, let your veneration for them restrain you from ever conceiving or perpetrating any base or impious action."

Cyaxares.

9. The only character of the *Cyropædia*, distinguished by genuine ethic spirit, is the hero's uncle Cyaxares; whose petty vices form a sort of offset to the lofty virtue of his nephew. A naturally well-disposed, but weak man, he is a kind parent to Cyrus in his infancy, and gratefully appreciates his youthful services for the common weal. He speedily however takes alarm at the magnitude of the war in which the young hero had embarked. His achievements, with the zeal of the Median warriors in his service, and their growing contempt for his own authority, inspire him with rancorous jealousy. He henceforward exerts himself, to the best of his sluggish ability, in obstructing his nephew's victorious progress. In the sequel, however, he becomes reconciled to the new state of things, partly by the welcome accessions which foreign conquest brings to his sensual enjoyments; and natural affection again resumes its sway in his breast. In the reconciliation scene between him and his nephew, his resentful sullenness and womanish emotion, the respectful bearing and soothing eloquence of Cyrus, and the gradual reaction of good feeling in the bosom of the pettish monarch, are all true to nature, and render this the most effective piece of dramatic action in the *Cyropædia*.¹

"The Assyrian."

Of the other leading royal personages, the Assyrian emperor, with appropriate subserviency to the Historian's object of exhibiting Cyrus in the right in his career of conquest, is described as a bloodthirsty tyrant, the aggressor in the quarrel, and whose acts

¹ v. v. 8.

of oppression drive his vassal chiefs into the ranks of the enemy. Cambyses displays, in his didactic eloquence, all the wisdom and virtue which would have qualified himself for a Cyrus, had he possessed the same opportunities. The Cræsus of the *Cyropædia* is a degenerate copy of the Cræsus of Herodotus. Xenophon omits his predecessor's beautiful legend, concerning the source of the conqueror's sympathy with the Lydian king's misfortunes; and the act of clemency so gracefully performed by the Cyrus of Herodotus, is attributed by Xenophon (as in the case of Panthea) to political expediency. The dialogues between the two monarchs are prosaic paraphrases of parallel texts of Herodotus; evincing, with other passages, Xenophon's familiarity with the work of his predecessor.¹ The favourite officers of Cyrus are all estimable, but uninteresting specimens of the "fidus Achates" order of secondary hero; Araspas alone forms a gentle exception to the general rule of blameless propriety.

Cambyses.

Cræsus.

Other
secondary
characters.

The concluding chapter, or Epilogue, as it has been styled, of this work, is a commentary in a bitter vein of sarcasm, on the degeneracy of the Persian nation under the successors of Cyrus. Its genuine character has been questioned by modern critics; and doubtless, if uncongeniality of one part of a work with the remainder is in any case to be held sufficient proof of spurious origin, there would here be little room for difference of opinion.

The
"Epi-
logue"
of the
*Cyropæ-
dia*.How far
genuine.

Whatever change may have taken place in the Persian character, between the age of Cyrus and that of Xenophon, it is certain that in every part of

¹ VII. ii. 9. sqq.; conf. Herodot. I. 46. sqq. 88.: VIII. vi. 17.; conf. Herodot. VIII. 98.

his collective works, with the exception of this Epilogue, when mentioning the Persian government and people as they existed in his own day, he mentions them, if not in such terms of encomium as in the *Cyropædia*, at least in terms of respect. In the previous text of the *Cyropædia*, not only are his praises of the hero's political system commonly so expressed, as to apply equally to the present and the past, but several of the institutions held up to admiration, are specified as still maintaining their ground. Yet these very institutions are described in the Epilogue as extinct, or superseded by gross abuses. Similar discrepancies are observable between the Epilogue and other genuine works of Xenophon. Anomalies of this kind could hardly be the result of oversight; and if Xenophon himself is responsible for them, they must have been introduced wilfully, under some peculiar influence or for some peculiar purpose.¹

Apart from its merits as a historical document, the Epilogue is a tasteless excrescence on the main body of the work. Among the beauties which chiefly compensate for the defects of the *Cyropædia*, attention has above been directed to its unity of epic action. The just epic conclusion of the narrative was obviously the death of the hero; and the evident care, as well as skill, with which Xenophon has worked up the death-bed scene, seems to evince his anxiety to show how well he understood the art of completing,

¹ The more palpable discrepancies are observable in *Cyrop.* i. ii. 11, 12. 16.; comp. viii. viii. 8. : i. iii. 2., viii. i. 6. 8. 96.; comp. viii. viii. 15. : iv. iii. 23.; comp. viii. viii. 13. : viii. vi. 14.; *Anab.* i. ix. 3. sq.; comp. *Cyrop.* viii. viii. 13. sqq.; *Æconom.* iv. 5. sq.

The statement in the Epilogue, viii. viii. 9., that the Persians in Cyrus's time ate but one meal a day, is contradicted by several passages of the previous text: vi. iv. 1. : conf. vii. i. 1. alibi.

as well as designing an epic narrative. The less easy is it to comprehend, how he could have deliberately defeated his own object, by dragging his readers, after the final catastrophe, through a long chapter of moral commentary, on a state of things altogether extraneous to his proper subject. The *Cyropædia*, it is true, is a didactic as well as a narrative work. But the principle of its composition is, that it should convey its lessons through the medium of epic or dramatic action. Here the author suddenly steps from behind the scene, and delivers in his own person his superfluous postscript. Nor must we overlook the grave stigma which it plants on the honour of the deceased hero, by representing the institutions which he had spent his life in establishing, as destitute of all organic bond of cohesion, and falling to pieces the moment his personal influence was removed. "No sooner," we are told, "was Cyrus dead, than his descendants began to quarrel among themselves. The subject cities and states revolted, and everything went rapidly from bad to worse."¹ In the sequel the mixture of flippancy, rhetorical casuistry, and vulgarity, in his attempts to impart humorous point to his satire, are the more offensive, from the contrast with the beauty and solemnity of the immediately preceding text.

These considerations, while all-powerful as reasons why the Epilogue ought not to have been composed at all, are not perhaps all-conclusive evidence of its not having been composed by Xenophon. On the affirmative side of the question may be urged, the absence of all doubt among native critics as to its genuine character, and the correspondence of its general

¹ § 2. sq.

style with that of the Historian's ascertained works. If, on these grounds, we may not be permitted to exculpate him from the charge of disfiguring the most elegant production of his genius, the more lenient view of his offence would be to assume, that the *Cyropædia* was originally composed in its just epic unity, at a time when the author still retained his early friendly feeling towards Persia and her institutions; that in his old age this feeling, from whatever cause, had given place to bitter animosity, under the influence of which the Epilogue was composed, as an antidote to any favourable impression left on the reader's mind by the previous narrative.

The only passages of the *Cyropædia* containing criteria for fixing the date of its composition, are in the Epilogue. Mention is there made of two events, which took place in the year 361 B.C., about ten years before the probable date of Xenophon's death. But from the apocryphal character of this portion of the text, suspicion must attach to these data.

CHAP. XV.

XENOPHON: HIS MINOR COMPOSITIONS.

1. HIS "POLITIES." "POLITY OF LACEDÆMON." "POLITY OF ATHENS." DATE OF ITS COMPOSITION.—2. A POLITICAL PASQUINADE. NOT BY XENOPHON.—3. "HIERO," OR THE TYRANT.—4. "ON THE ATHENIAN REVENUES." CAUSES OF THEIR DECLINE. REFORMS SUGGESTED.—5 "AGESILAUS." A GENUINE WORK OF XENOPHON. PARALLEL OF THE HELLENICA, IN PARTIALITY, IN SUPPRESSION, IN MISREPRESENTATION.—6. THE "MEMORABILIA" OF SOCRATES. PARALLEL OF THE AGESILAUS. SCOPE OF THE WORK. CHARACTER OF SOCRATES, AS CONCEIVED BY XENOPHON.—7. HIS RANGE AND METHOD OF SCIENTIFIC INSTRUCTION.—8. HIS MORAL SENTIMENT AND DISCIPLINE. THE "APOLOGY OF SOCRATES." HOW FAR A GENUINE WORK OF XENOPHON.—9. "THE SYMPOSIUM." PLAN OF THE WORK. PART ALLOTTED TO SOCRATES. EPITOME OF THE CONTENTS. THE JESTER. THE BALLET-MASTER. PANDERISM OF SOCRATES. HIS COMPETITION FOR THE PALM OF BEAUTY. HIS ALTERCATION WITH HERMOGENES, AND WITH THE BALLET-MASTER. LASCIVIOUS DANCE.—10. PARALLEL OF PLATO'S SYMPOSIUM. XENOPHON'S FACETIOUS HUMOUR.—11. "THE ŒCONOMIST." ATHENIAN SYSTEM OF HOUSEKEEPING, AND OF AGRICULTURE.—12. "ON THE EQUESTRIAN ART." DIRECTIONS FOR PURCHASING A HORSE. HIS STABLING AND KEEP. ART OF EQUITATION. "THE HIPPARCHUS," OR COMMANDER OF CAVALRY.—13. "ON HUNTING." HARE-SNARING AND NETTING. DEER-CATCHING. BOAR-HUNTING. HUNTING OF LIONS, LEOPARDS, AND OTHER WILD BEASTS. USE AND VALUE OF THE ART OF HUNTING IN PEACE AND WAR. SOPHISTICAL OBJECTIONS COMBATED.

1. As the two short treatises entitled Polity of Lacedæmon, and Polity of Athens, possess, besides their kindred subject, several features in common, it will be desirable, before any separate notice of each, to offer a few remarks on the two conjointly. While entitled to rank in common as the earliest preserved examples of Political essay, neither supplies what its title appears to promise, a specific account of the particular system of government of

The
Politics
of Xeno-
phon.

which it treats. Each is but a series of commentaries on certain more prominent characteristics of the system. We have no history of its origin, no description of its several magistracies or legislative bodies, their separate powers and functions; or of the different classes of citizens, and their respective rights and duties. The reader is assumed already to possess a competent knowledge of these fundamental points; and the few descriptive notices bestowed on them are but incidental to the author's speculative remarks. Some accordingly are noticed in detail; others are passed over altogether. In the Lacedæmonian Polity, the Homœi or Peers are mentioned¹ as a privileged body, but without any explanation of their quality or position in the commonwealth. We must look elsewhere for the fact that they were the Spartiate aristocracy, as distinguished from the secondary class of freemen, the Pericœci, and Neodamodes. Neither of these secondary classes, nor the Helot, or servile population, assuredly no unimportant, though humble element of the Lacedæmonian Polity, are so much as mentioned. The Athenian Polity is perhaps, still more than the sister tract, a critical rather than a historical treatise, on a state of things assumed to be familiar to the well-informed reader.

How far this purely speculative mode of treatment may have been peculiar to these two essays, how far common to such political dissertations in Xenophon's time, are questions to be further considered in connexion with the miscellaneous literature of the Attic period, to which the essays themselves properly belong. It may here suffice to remark, that in neither case can the common defect, if such it be, form a rea-

¹ x. 7., xiii. 7.

sonable argument that the tracts, as modern commentators¹ have conjectured, are but imperfect epitomēs of originally more ample works. The fallacy of this hypothesis seems to be evinced, by the feature of each essay on which it is founded. The province of an epitomist is to condense the substance of the work on which he operates, by discarding its illustrative details. Here the process would have been reversed, the speculative commentary retained, the material substance rejected. It has further been conjectured², that each treatise is but a fragment of some more comprehensive work on Political government. This theory rests partly on the same alleged desultory mode of treatment; partly on a certain abruptness in the opening passages, indicating, it is supposed, the continuation of a previous text. But here again the analogy of Greek literary usage is unfavourable. This same abruptness of commencement seems, from the age of the *Odyssey* downwards, to have been a common expedient for relieving the formality of a regular exordium. Its prevalence among popular essay-writers in Xenophon's time, especially those of the Socratic school, appears from a comparison of other works in his own collection, and of kindred compositions by contemporaneous authors.³

The title of either work to be a genuine production of Xenophon has been questioned, with good reason in

¹ Weiske, *De Auctor. et Integr. Lib. de Rep. Lac.* 5.

² Schneid. *Proleg. ad Libr. de Rep. Athen.* p. 79. sqq.

³ The coincidences of verbal expression between the opening passage of the *Laced. Polity* and those of the *Cyropædia* and *Convivium*, can leave no reasonable doubt that the former is genuine. Compare also ii. 1. with *Cyrop.* i. ii. 2, 3.

the case of the sister tract on Athens, but on no sufficient grounds in regard to

THE POLITY OF LACEDÆMON.

Polity of
Lacedæ-
mon.

The best evidence of the genuine character of this essay is supplied by its own text. No work in the collection is more broadly marked by the ordinary characteristics of Xenophon's style; by meagreness of substance and partiality of judgement; by his peculiar Laconian predilections manifested in his peculiar manner; by the discussion of military matters in the same technical forms familiar in the *Cyropædia* and *Anabasis*. The text consequently abounds in characteristic phrases, recurring in others of his acknowledged works.¹

The mode of commentary is that of contrast between the Spartan institutions and those of other states, imparting at times a tone of antithetical man-

¹ See especially the comparison, common to the *Hellenica*, of the attack of a phalanx to that of a war galley: *De Rep. Lac.* xi. 10.; *Hellen.* vii. v. 23. The only ancient author mentioned as sceptical, is Demetrius Magnes, a second-rate grammarian in the time of Cicero, ap. *Diog. Laert. Xen.* 57. His opinion can have little weight against those of Polybius, Plutarch, Longinus, and the general sense of the classical public. See Weiske, *de Auct. et Integr. Lib. de Rep. Lac.* ap. Schneid. tom. vi., and Sauppe, *Preface to the 2nd edit. of Schneider's text*, tom. vi. p. xx. sqq. The objections which have been urged by modern commentators are valid only against the short section xiv., contrasting the former purity of the system with its corruption in the days of the essayist. This, there is every reason to believe, is an interpolation. It has no connexion either with what precedes or with what follows, and is as completely out of character, as it is out of place in the text. It represents Xenophon, not only as expressing opinions foreign to his habits, but as in broad contradiction with himself; the whole eulogistic portion of the tract bearing reference to the existing state of things. The single half page which the spurious passage occupies, also contains at least three expressions foreign to Xenophontean usage: ἀρμόζοντα (in the sense of "filling the office of harmost"), θρασύως εἰπεῖν, and ἐπιφύγων.

nerism to the style.¹ The Spartan code of law and social discipline, is indiscriminately held up to admiration, as superior in all respects to all others. Some of its more offensive features, such as the Cryptia, child-murder, and more glaring atrocities of the Helot system, are suppressed; while the legalised thieving², adultery³, and other unnatural practices⁴, are placed in the most favourable or least odious light. The arrangement of the author's limited stock of materials is not wanting in method. He begins with the laws regarding the procreation of children⁵, passes on to their education, from boyhood to youth and mature age, and describes the duties and occupations of those different stages of life. The only political office treated in any detail is that of the kings⁶, as specially charged with the military organisation, which engrosses a large share of attention.⁷ Xenophon subscribes to the popular tradition which represented Lycurgus as the founder of the Spartan constitution; but dissents from that tradition, by carrying his age back to the Dorian conquest of Peloponnesus.⁸

The essay contains no specific data for judging of the time of its composition. It is not however likely that Xenophon should have taken the interest which it manifests in Spartan home politics, prior to his settlement in Peloponnesus. Although therefore the work has above been ranked, conjointly with the sister essay, as the earliest specimen of this kind of political treatise, the title to priority as between the two is altogether in favour of

¹ Compare i. 2, 3., ii. 12, iii. 1., vi. 1., vii. 1., viii. 2.

² i. 8.

³ xiii., xv.

⁴ ii. 13.

⁵ xi., xii.

⁶ ii. 6. sqq.

⁷ i. 3.

⁸ x. 8.

THE POLITY OF ATHENS.

Polity of
Athens.

Date of its
composition.

A political
pasquinade.

The whole tone of this spirited little tract shows it to have been written at a stage of the Peloponnesian war, when the Athenian arms had not yet experienced any decisive reverse. The sway of the imperial Democracy over her dependent states, and her hold on her foreign possessions, are represented as still firm; her revenues as undiminished, her prosperity unimpaired. The essay must therefore have been composed before 413 B.C., the year of the Syracusan disaster, which so rapidly changed the condition and prospects of the republic. To these more general arguments may be added special points of internal evidence. From Thucydides¹ we learn, that in the year 415 B.C. the direct tribute paid to Athens by her maritime allies was abolished, and in lieu of it a transit duty of five per cent was imposed on their import and export trade. In the essay the tribute is mentioned as still exigible in its previous form; and is so mentioned, not incidentally or in a general way, but in the author's special notice of the public revenue.² The witty remarks to be quoted in the sequel, on the colonial jurisdiction of Athens, also indicate a state of things to which the Syracusan catastrophe speedily put an end.³

2. The treatise is thus clearly entitled to rank as the oldest recorded work in this department of composition. It possesses however still another claim to originality, as the oldest extant specimen of a political pasquinade. Under an assumed mask of apology,

¹ vii. 28.

² iii. 5. : conf. 2. ii. 1.

³ For other more detailed arguments, see Schneider, *Proleg. ad Libr. de Rep. Athen.*; Roscher, in *Götting. Gel. Anz.* 1841, No. 42., and in his *Leben, &c., des Thucydides*, p. 526. sqq.

which, though purposely made to sit but loosely, has imposed on very learned commentators, the essay is conceived throughout in a lively and bitter tone of sarcasm against the abuses, real or imputed, of the Athenian Democracy. The plan of satirical treatment is announced by the author in the opening passage here subjoined :

"I cannot indeed commend the Athenians for having, in their choice of a form of government, preferred one in which rogues fare better than honest men. This much however I will engage to prove, that having once made their selection, in those parts of their conduct for which they are blamed by other Greek politicians they act consistently, and in the interest of their own commonwealth."

The engagement here contracted he proceeds to fulfil in an insidious vein of irony, or "persiflage;" with just so much interspersion of practical remark, as may help to maintain, in outward show, the gravity in which he pretends to conduct his argument. All the more glaring iniquities or abuses in the working of the system are justified, as being necessary to give effect to the fundamental principle of abuse and iniquity on which the system was based. The following extracts will suffice to illustrate the general spirit of the text to which they belong :

"Surprise has been expressed that in Athens, rogues, paupers, and low people, should be more favoured than better men. But this seems to be required for the support of the Democracy. It is by maintaining and increasing the number of these rogues, paupers, and low people, that the Democracy itself is strengthened and extended. Were the body of the people to encourage prosperity in the wealthy and respectable class, they would be adding weight to the interest adverse to themselves."¹

"Any worthless person is entitled (at Athens) to propose in council what he thinks best for himself and those like himself: But,

¹ i. 4. sq.

I hear some one remark: Surely no such person can be expected to suggest anything beneficial either to himself or to the public. The Athenians however argue, that the ignorance and vice of such a councillor, friendly to themselves, is better than the wisdom and virtue of an honest man ill-affected to their interest. Granting that this may not be the best mode of governing a state, it is the best mode of maintaining a Democracy.”¹

“Nowhere is so great license permitted to slaves and aliens, as at Athens. You are not allowed to strike a slave; nor will he stand out of your way in the street. Of this I will explain the reason. If a freeman were permitted by law to strike slaves or aliens, he would be continually striking an Athenian by mistake, supposing him to be a slave. For the Athenian people are no better dressed than the slaves or aliens, nor in any respect better in appearance.”²

“The Democracy seems also open to censure, for compelling its allies to bring their law pleas for decision before the Athenian tribunals. But to this the Athenians reply, that the practice is to them a source of many advantages. For, in the first place, it adds to their annual income as judges and jurymen; and besides, they are thus enabled, sitting at home, without foreign armaments, to uphold their party in those states, by favouring such litigants as belong to that party, and ruining by their verdicts those of the opposite interest.”³

“I have also heard people complain, that it is sometimes impossible to get business transacted at Athens, either before the supreme or the inferior courts, although a man should await their pleasure during a year. But the only reason of this is, that owing to the quantity of business to be done, it is not practicable to get through it with dispatch. Can it be considered wonderful, that men, who, besides all their legislative duties, all the affairs of state foreign and domestic to which they must attend, with all the trouble of collecting tribute from their allies, have twice as many feasts and holidays to celebrate as any other Greek community, and more law pleas, civil and criminal, on their hands, than the whole remainder of the human race, should have some difficulty in finding time to transact ordinary business with all and sundry? . . . It has indeed been said, that if a man appears in council or court with money in his hand, his business will be

¹ i. 6. sq.² i. 10. sq.³ i. 16.

dispatched. This I admit ; much may be done at Athens by means of money ; and much more might be done, were more people able and willing to pay money. But still I maintain, that even an unlimited supply of money would not enable the Athenians to get through the amount of business which they are called upon to perform.”¹

“ I find no fault with the democratic order itself, for preferring a democratic government, everyone being entitled to look first to his own interest. But a man, not of that order, who selects as his place of abode a city under democratic rather than one under aristocratic rule, must be actuated by some nefarious motive ; well knowing, how much more easy it is to play the rogue without detection, under the one than the other form of government.”²

This broadly satirical tone is relieved by acute remarks on interesting points of national economy. Such are the commentaries on the policy, power, and resources of Athens, in her relation both to the subject states and the rival confederacy, and on the comparative strength and weakness of her naval and military establishments.³

The title of this treatise to rank as a genuine production of Xenophon has been questioned by modern critics, more generally, and with better reason than that of any other in the list of his reputed works. There is no appearance of their doubts having here been anticipated by the antients, whose notices of this tract are indeed so few, and of so low a period, as to imply that it was less read and appreciated by the native public than it deserved.

Not a
genuine
work of
Xenophon.

The first objection that offers itself, is the date of its composition. In 414 B.C., the lowest that can be assigned to it, Xenophon was but twenty-one years of age ; and if, as is probable, its composition took place a year or two sooner, the improbability

¹ iii. 1. sqq.

² ii. 20.

³ ii. 1. sqq., 11. sqq.

bility of his having commenced authorship so early and in so spirited a manner, would be the greater. This difficulty, if it stood alone, might not perhaps be insuperable. The tone of the essay, in its lively familiarity, effervescing at times into petulance, with a certain quaint tendency to egotistical *prosopopœia*¹, savours perhaps more of juvenile license than of mature taste and practice in composition. It were nothing incredible that a clever young Athenian Aristocrat should, even at so early an age, have thrown together, in this form, his thoughts on the ultrademocracy of his native city. There is more in the general style of the work, and in the order of talent which it displays, than in its age, to disconnect it with Xenophon. It would not be easy to discover in any one of his ascertained productions, a continuous text of equal length, distinguished by a similar combination of subtle thought, caustic argument, and concise expression. The vein of satire here also differs widely from the "frigid humour" of the *Cyropædia*, or the licentious pleasantry of the *Symposium*. If Xenophon is the author, we must assume, as in the case of his hero Cyrus, that the stock of genuine wit with which nature had endowed him, had been so largely drawn upon in early youth, as to leave little more than the dregs to savour the eloquence of his maturer years.

As the circulation in Athens of such a libel on her government, either at the time when it was written,

¹ i. 11., ii. 11., 12. The remark may be extended to the familiar exclamation *φέρε δὴ* (iii. 5. 7.) which occurs in this tract alone of the collection; also to the expression *ὅσα ἔτη* (iii. 4.) used thrice in the sense of *ἐκάστου ἔτους*; and to that of *λελήθασιν μανθάνοντες* (i. 19.), where the verb *λανθάνω* seems to be used in a purely "subjective" sense peculiar to this passage.

or during any period of Athenian independence, would have entailed on its author the penalty of death or banishment, it may be inferred that he was either a foreigner or an exile; and his mode of expressing himself is that of a person writing beyond the limits of Attica. This forms another bar to Xenophon's claim to be that person; the suspension of friendly relations between himself and his native republic being of long posterior date. Nor is it likely that he could have written the passage¹ in which it is said, that "Athenian citizens were never lampooned "on the stage, unless distinguished either for rank "or wealth, or by their meddling and factious opposition to popular rights;" Socrates having been lampooned by Aristophanes in B.C. 423, and by other contemporary comedians, long before Xenophon could have commenced authorship.²

HIERO, OR THE TYRANT.

3. In the historical romance of the *Cyropædia*, Hiero,
or the
Tyrant. Xenophon has developed his theory of a perfect system of monarchy. In the *Lacedæmonian Polity*, he has illustrated what he considered the best form of a mixed monarchical and aristocratical constitution. In the "*Hiero*" he treats of that spurious species of monarchy called by the Greeks a "*Tyranny*," or in other

¹ ii. 18.

² Diog. Laert. Vit. Socrat. 28. The evidence as to the precise year in which the tract may have been written, derivable from the allusions in its text to the Attic comedy, have been discussed by Schneider (ad ii. 18. and Proleg. p. 93.), Roscher (op. sup. cit. p. 531.), and Boeckh (*Staatsk. der Ath.* vol. i. p. 434. 2nd ed.). Boeckh conjectures Critias to have been the author; but the playful humour of the tract seems even less in keeping with the genius of that gloomy tyrant, than of Xenophon.

words, a Despotism, founded on the overthrow of constitutional government. There is however this difference between the Hiero and those other compositions, that its tendency is not properly political, but ethic. It examines neither the modes in which a tyranny may originate, nor the policy by which the constitutional party may best counteract the despot's schemes, or undermine the tyrannical government in its turn. The argument is mainly directed against the vulgar opinion, that the possession of tyrannical power, with its unlimited sources of personal gratification, is necessarily a source of happiness, or the tyrant a happier man than the private citizen. It is urged that the disquietudes inseparable from his dignity, disqualify him for the same enjoyment of life which is common to other men. The greater part of the treatise is, in fact, a commentary on the familiar anecdote of the sword of Damocles. A relief is afforded at the close, to the general gloom of the picture, by the admission, that an enlightened tyrant, who studies to promote the good of his people, may himself enjoy a share of that happiness, which a generous-minded man experiences in contributing to the welfare of others.

The treatise is shaped in the form of a dialogue between Simonides the lyric poet, and Hiero tyrant of Syracuse. The popular view is advocated by Simonides, who recapitulates most of the popular reasons why a tyrant is, or ought to be, the happiest of men. Hiero in reply puts forth, in formidable array and with the greater force, speaking as he does from experience, the reasons why a tyrant is of all men the most unhappy. He maintains, that even the unlimited power to gratify desire, which on first view may appear a blessing, tends, like the excess of grati-

fication, to produce the satiety which mars enjoyment¹; that no man can be happy who lives in a perpetual state of alarm, and that such is the lot of every tyrant. His power being founded on injustice, he must be an object of hatred to all virtuous men; every man is justified in putting him to death, and every good citizen ready to take his life, where it can be done without risk to his own. It follows that the destruction of the best citizens must be his ruling policy; that his only protectors are his paid guards, and those whom he can induce by like mercenary means to espouse his interests²; and the funds for these purposes being raised by extortion from the community, the bitterness of their hostility is proportionally increased; that a tyrant is a slave in many things where the private man is free; he can neither in his own country, with safety to his person, freely pass from place to place in pursuit of business or pleasure, nor freely visit other countries with safety to his government at home.³ His house is to him like a besieged camp⁴, perpetually on the alarm against the open assaults or secret intrigues of enemies. In proof of the fatal influence of tyrannical power on the tenderest ties of natural affection, he points to the number of cases in which tyrants have slain their own sons, or have themselves been slain by their children, their wives, their brothers, or the friends in whom they chiefly trusted.⁵

To these and other such arguments Simonides replies by the very natural question: "Why then does he not abdicate a dignity which has proved to him a source of misery?"⁶ The answer is, that the

¹ i. 17. sq.

⁴ ii. 7. sqq., vi. 4.

² v. 1. sqq., vi. 5.

⁵ iii. 8., i. 38.

³ i. 11, 12., ii. 8.

⁶ vii. 11.

impossibility of taking this step, unless at the risk of self-destruction, is one of the greatest hardships to which the tyrant is subjected; that if once denuded of his power, the vengeance of those whom he had oppressed, or whose friends he had put to death, would speedily overtake him.

The remainder of the argument is left in the hands of Simonides, who maintains, and with good effect, that it is quite possible, in spite of all that Hiero has said, for an enlightened tyrant, by a wise and philanthropic exercise of his power, to be both a powerful and a popular ruler.¹

This dialogue is among the most pleasing of Xenophon's didactic compositions. The characters are well preserved, and the argument well conducted. The apologetic side of the question has been appropriately allotted to Simonides, whose fine genius and amiable qualities secured him favour at the courts of the Greek princes who form the subject of the dialogue, and many of whom were distinguished patrons of literature. Several of those whose confidence he enjoyed, might also have been cited as illustrating by their characters the latter part of his own argument. On others he is recorded, in more strictly historical accounts, to have exercised the beneficial influence which he is here endeavouring, with doubtful success, to establish over Hiero. The other side of the question has with equal propriety been assigned to Hiero; who, as neither the best nor the worst of his class, is without inconsistency made to condemn the course of life in which, on the Macchiavellian grounds alleged, he yet feels constrained to persevere.

¹ viii. sqq.

ON THE REVENUES OF ATHENS.

4. In this patriotic tract, Xenophon recommends certain reforms in the financial system of Athens, and in connexion with them, other beneficial changes in her policy. During the flourishing age of the republic, the great body of the citizens had been trained to habits of idleness.¹ They lived at the expense of the state, or rather of those tributary allies, by whom the charges of the state were then almost entirely borne; partly on the fees paid for the performance real or nominal of civic duties, partly on the sums distributed to each citizen, ostensibly as entrance money to places of public entertainment. This abuse once authorised, came to be recognised as an indefeasible right. It entailed consequently in after times, when the disasters of the republic had dried up her foreign sources of supply, an oppressive burthen on her ordinary revenue, and on the upper class of citizens, by whom the deficit of that revenue required to be made good. In his proposed scheme of reform, Xenophon does not venture to strike at the root of the evil, by withholding, or seriously curtailing, the wages of idleness. He is content with pointing out the modes in which the internal resources of the republic, if skilfully developed, might be made to suffice for her expenditure, without the imposition of burthensome taxes, either on her provinces or her own citizens. He dwells² on the abundance of her natural productions, especially her mineral wealth, and her advantages as an emporium of trade, in respect to geographical position and otherwise. He suggests measures for increasing the number and improving the condition of the "Metæci,"

On the
Revenues
of Athens.

Causes of
their de-
cline.

Reforms
suggested.

¹ Boeckh, *Staatsab. der Ath.* II. 13.

² i. 2. seq.

or resident foreigners, of whom chiefly consisted the free portion of the labouring class, and who were also the chief or only regular tax-payers. He would extend their right of holding property, with their other municipal franchises; would relieve them from their present obligation to serve as soldiers, and restrict that duty to the citizens.¹ He would promote commerce, and augment the customs duties, by holding out greater inducement to foreign ships to frequent the ports of Athens, by a more honourable treatment of merchants, by enlarging the public marts and warehouses, and otherwise facilitating the transaction of mercantile business.² He further suggests that the government should itself undertake commercial enterprise; partly with the public funds, partly by voluntary subscriptions from the citizens, who should share in the profits, as a dividend on their investments.³ It is however to the Laurian silver mines that he more especially directs attention, as calculated, under proper management, to prove the most fertile source of national income. He gives some interesting details of the early history of these works, and argues from the great profits realised by private speculators, even under the present imperfect system, how much might be done by an improved mode of development, under the direction of the state. He urges therefore on the government the expediency of taking the management into their own hands on a principle similar to that proposed for their commercial navy, of admitting private adventurers to a share in the capital stock and its returns.⁴

After combating objections⁵ which, he anticipated,

¹ ii. 2.

² iii. 1. sqq., 12. sqq.

³ iii. 6. sqq., 14. sq.

⁴ iv. 1. sqq.

⁵ iv. 34. sq.

might be urged against his views, he dwells on the importance of a durable peace, and hence of a peaceful policy, to the success of every measure of national improvement.¹ He refutes the doctrine that a habitual state of warfare was necessary to uphold, either the patriotic feeling or the military energies of a nation, or in any other respect conducive to national prosperity; and concludes with a pious injunction to his fellow-citizens, before acting on his advice, to test its value, by an appeal to the Dodonæan and Delphic oracles, and to be guided by their decrees in the adoption or rejection of his plans.²

This tract, composed about 354 B.C.³, has been assumed on plausible grounds to have been addressed to Eubulus of Anaphlystus, the Attic statesman to whom Xenophon is reported to owe his recall from banishment⁴, and who was then in active management of the Athenian finances. Although written towards the close of the author's long life, it shows no symptoms of old age or impaired faculties. The tone of the work is in all respects creditable to the writer, indicating a spirit not only of reconciliation with his native country, but of affectionate interest in her welfare. His views are distinctly explained and modestly asserted. Few of them are much in accordance with modern principles of political economy; some palpably fallacious. But the spirit at least in which they are conceived is rational; and many of his suggestions, if honestly carried into effect, might have helped to promote industrious habits, and freshen up the languor and decay of Athenian financial and commercial policy.

¹ v.² vi.³ Supra p. 182.⁴ Schneid. ad iii. 7.: Boeckh, Staatsh. der Athen. iv. 21.

THE AGESILAUS.

The
Agesilaus.

5. In this treatise, the notices of Agesilaus contained in the *Hellenica*, have been digested into a separate memoir, with supplementary remarks on the latter part of his life, not comprised within the period of which the *Hellenica* treats. Although a biographical work, it is not a Biography. It gives not even an outline of its hero's entire life; no account of the forty years of it preceding his accession to the Spartan throne; none of his death, beyond the fact that he died before the memoir was composed. The first half of the text is historical, containing an abridged description of such of his acts or undertakings, as conduced to his honour; everything of an opposite tendency being omitted. This part consists in a great measure of passages common to the *Hellenica*. The other half is an encomiastic commentary on what precedes. The work may be defined as the concentrated essence of Xenophon's morbid veneration for his model Spartan warrior. The modes in which this weakness is exemplified in the *Hellenica* and in the *Agesilaus*, are so much the same, as to render what has been said regarding it in treating of the one work equally applicable to the other. The few remarks here subjoined will be directed in a great measure to the proofs which that sameness supplies, that the *Agesilaus* is a genuine work of Xenophon; its title to that honour having been questioned by modern critics.

A genuine
work of
Xenophon.

It is not probable, in the first place, that any other writer of the same age as Xenophon, or of any other age, should have carried his admiration for this particular Spartan king, to the same idolatrous extent as that of Xenophon has been carried.

Still less probable is it, that if possessed by this monomania, he should also have given expression to it in modes so curiously identical with those resorted to by the rival panegyrist; modes, in themselves so subtle and peculiar, as to indicate a certain idiosyncrasy of thought and character, not likely to fall to the lot of more than a single philo-Laconian man of letters. It is improbable, thirdly, that if qualified so well to imitate the style and method of Xenophon, he should have marred the originality of his own production, by composing it to the extent of one fourth, of passages pirated from the Hellenica. That this plagiarism should have been adduced, as it has been, in proof of non-Xenophontean origin, seems a reversal of the just order of reasoning. It is not easy to see what advantage a different author could have derived from such a course. But it was quite in the spirit of Greek classical literature, for the same author, in undertaking a separate Biography of one whose acts he had already recorded in a general history of his time, to avail himself, when describing the same events, of the same once well-digested set of passages. Those passages, it will also be observed, are rarely reproduced to the letter: and the modifications which they have undergone, are not only in pure Xenophontean style, but in not a few instances are improvements on the text of the Hellenica; indicating a revisal by the original author, rather than the tampering of a plagiarist.¹

The best proof that the Xenophon of the Hellenica and the Xenophon of the Agesilaus are the same person, is the correspondence of the manner in which,

Parallel of
the Helle-
nica and
the Agesi-
laus:

¹ Conf. Schneid. nott. ad locc., and Lord Brougham: Demosthenes; Edinb. Rev. vol. xxxvi. p. 86.; and Works, ed. 1856, vol. vii. p. 176.

in partial-
ities ;

in
suppres-
sion ;

in mis-
representa-
tion.

by each, the merits of the common subject of encomium are exaggerated, and the counterclaims of rivals in celebrity depreciated, or kept out of view. In each may be observed, where the less honourable portions of the hero's history are under treatment, the same systematic concealment of his errors, and the same cunning method of diverting attention from such uncongenial topics, by lavish commendation of trivial merits, or elaborate justification of his conduct from imaginary censures. For the actual suppression of discreditable matter, the *Hellenica* afforded, in one respect, less favourable opportunities than the *Agésilæus*. In a historical work in the proper sense, it was more or less indispensable that events of great notoriety, whether creditable or otherwise to particular individuals, should be mentioned, whatever partial colouring might be spread over them. But in a biographical commentary, the writer was free to mention or omit at discretion. Of this freedom the author of the *Agésilæus* has largely availed himself. Not a single fact in any way compromising his hero's character is noticed. The seizure of the *Cadmea*, immediately after the peace of *Antalcidas*, the sanction of which act by *Agésilæus* is the worst blot on his character, could not be suppressed by the Historian. It has been carefully suppressed by the Biographer. In noticing the changes in the fortune of *Sparta* during the period subsequent to that peace, he leaps at once over her principal misdeeds to an event which, in the true spirit of Xenophontean misrepresentation, he calls¹ "the slaughter of the *Lacedæmonians* by their adversaries in *Thebes*." None but a reader intimately conversant with Xenophon's historical method, would ever guess that

¹ ii. 22.

what is here meant, is the recovery by the Thebans of their citadel, from the perfidious Spartan band, who had seized it in defiance of the faith of treaties. The sequel of the same context is another example of Xenophon's mode of masking the real delinquencies of Agesilaus, by vindicating him from imaginary imputations. In the *Hellenica* the seizure of the Cadmea is described¹, in several characteristic passages, both as the primary source of Sparta's calamities, and as having been sanctioned by Agesilaus, against the better feeling of his countrymen. In the *Agesilaus*, as already said, there is no allusion to this matter. But in noticing the ensuing military disasters at Leuctra and elsewhere, the Biographer strenuously vindicates his hero from all responsibility in regard to them. "No man," it is said, "would venture to assert, that they took place under his leadership."² This passage, in the strict connexion of the text, means simply that Agesilaus was not in command of the Spartan forces defeated on those occasions; but its ambiguous latitude of expression is plainly calculated to be misunderstood by the general reader, as exculpating him from having been in any respect instrumental to the national misfortunes. The Biographer has here also suppressed another fact discreditable to his hero, which the Historian has felt himself constrained to mention; the refusal of Agesilaus, on unworthy pretexts, to take the command of the national army, in those same disastrous wars in which, by his own impolicy, his country had been involved.³ This silence regarding the affair of the Cadmea, and other discreditable transactions recorded in the *Hellenica*, such as the reprieve

¹ See above, p. 309. sqq.² ii. 23.³ See above, p. 309.

of Sphodrias, and the coercion of Phlius and Mantinea, enables the Biographer, without incurring the charge of self-contradiction, to enumerate among the other admirable qualities of Agesilaus, his scrupulous good faith and pious respect for the sanctity of treaties.¹

The care with which the Historian evades allusion to rivals whose deeds tended to eclipse those of his favourite, has been more than emulated by the Biographer. We hear something of Pharnabazus, Tissaphernes, and other minor opponents of Agesilaus. But the names of Pelopidas and Epaminondas, so rarely introduced in the *Hellenica*, are altogether excluded from the Agesilaus. The invasion of the Spartan territory is referred to, and with all justice, as a crisis in which the patriotism and military virtue of the Spartan king shone conspicuous. But the terms in which the invasion itself is described, are so framed as to deprive its leaders of all merit in the matter. "When Laconia," it is said, "was invaded by the Arcadians, Argives, Eleans, and Boeotians," &c.² Who, not previously cognisant of Xenophon's method of misrepresentation, could suppose that this expedition, in which the Boeotians are allowed to take part in the wake of three or four other second-rate powers, was the triumphal march of Epaminondas at the head of his anti-Spartan confederacy, from the field of Leuctra to the mouth of the Eurotas? Where, on the other hand, the fortune of war was reversed, as at Corinth and Coronea, and the subject on hand was the triumph of Agesilaus over an army of which "The Thebans," those special objects of his hatred, formed part, their share in the defeat is readily conceded.³

Other more pleasing evidence that the Biographer

¹ iii. 2. sq.

² ii. 24.

³ ii. 9. sqq.

was a contemporary and personal friend of Agesilaus, are the passages allusive to his death, as to a recent event of deep interest to the writer; passages conceived in a tone of genuine feeling, which seems to vouch both for their authenticity and their sincerity.¹

The most plausible argument on the sceptical side, is founded on the rhetorical tone of the concluding chapter, which, it has been justly remarked, is little in keeping with Xenophon's ordinary style. The genuine character of passages must however in such cases be tested, not by comparison with an author's ordinary style, but with other portions of his works which are equally exceptions to the general rule. It is certain that Xenophon's language, commonly so easy and natural, is apt to become rhetorically sententious, to an almost Thucydidean extent, on occasions where he is ambitious, as here, of imparting emphatic point to his descriptions of character. The same antithetical tone is observable in other parallel texts: in the *Anabasis* for example, in the characteristics of the slain generals, especially of Menon.² The only difference between the cases seems to be, that in this concluding summary of Xenophon's favourite hero's excellences, the effort is greater and more prolonged, in proportion to the writer's greater enthusiasm for his subject.³

This tract was probably written shortly after the death of Agesilaus, to which it alludes, and which took place in 360 B. C.

¹ x. 3., xi. 15. sqq.

² II. vi. 21.

³ For other coincidences of style, between the *Agesilaus* and the ascertained works of Xenophon, tending to establish community of authorship, compare *Ages.* v. 6., with *Anab.* II. vi. 28.; *Ages.* ii. 7., with *Cyrop.* VII. i. 2., VI. iv. 1.; *Ages.* v. 6. in fine, with *Memorab.* I. i. 11.; *Ages.* vi. 4., with *Cyrop.* VII. i. 30.

THE MEMORABILIA OF SOCRATES.

Scope of
the work.

6. This composition bears to the entire life of Socrates a relation similar to that which the Agesilaus bears to the life of its hero. Both are biographical works, but neither of them is a Biography; such historical notices as each contains of the person celebrated, being but ancillary to the more immediate object of illustrating his character.

As the most effectual mode of achieving his object, Xenophon opens his series of commentaries, not with the birth, youth, or manhood of his friend and master, but with his death, as being, in truth, the most important and interesting part of his history. He begins by expressing wonder, how the Athenians could ever have been persuaded by the enemies of Socrates, to condemn him on charges so futile as those contained in his indictment, the heads of which he subjoins: I. That he disavowed the gods whom the state acknowledged, and introduced other gods in their stead. II. That he had corrupted the morals of the Athenian youth.

On the first he remarks, that its falsehood was evinced by the philosopher's habitual performance of sacrifice to the national deities, both on the public altars and in his own dwelling.¹ He refutes the allegation that the divine warnings with which Socrates professed to be favoured, were at variance with the national faith, or differed in any essential degree from those which other pious men were in the habit of drawing from omens, dreams, or similar manifestations. He maintains that the philosopher's doctrine on this point evinced his reverence for the gods in

1. i. 2.

two ways. While he condemned any recourse to the arts of divination in the daily affairs of life, as superfluous and disrespectful to the deity, who by endowing men with reason had enabled them in such cases to judge for themselves, he both enjoined and observed the duty of calling to aid the divine counsel in greater emergencies.¹ The other charge of attempting to corrupt the morals of youth, is met by a reference to the purity of his own life, and the absurdity of supposing that one, himself of unblemished habits, should endeavour to seduce others into vicious courses.² He repudiates the fallacious argument of his master's accusers, that a school which produced such disloyal citizens as Alcibiades and Critias, must itself have been a seminary of mischievous doctrines. He urges as a counter-argument, the many other excellent characters trained in the same school; and shows, by interesting notices of those two men, that their lives had at least been kept in wholesome restraint while under the philosopher's tuition, and that their evil qualities were first developed under the evil influence to which they were afterwards exposed.³

His vindication of his master from these calumnious charges is followed by a commentary on the real excellence of his character⁴, his piety, virtue, wisdom, patriotism. His philosophic doctrines, his habits of thought, and of social intercourse, are illustrated by reports of those dialogues with his disciples and friends, through which he was accustomed to convey his instructions. The subjects treated in these discourses are numerous and varied, extending from the

¹ I. i. 4. sqq.² I. ii. 1. sqq.³ I. ii. 12. sqq.⁴ I. iii.—v.

more important obligations of life, moral, political, and religious, to its ordinary arts and occupations. Among those who take part are found, accordingly, besides his own disciples and friends, men of all classes; military officers, sculptors, painters, and artificers of humbler rank.¹ The treatise concludes with a few brief notices of the last hours of his life.² It contains no detailed account of his trial, or the line of defence which he adopted. Its general composition, while in substance, as usual with Xenophon, meagre and superficial, is not deficient in order and narrative connexion.

Character
of Socrates

It is not our intention here to embark on the wider range of speculative discussion, for which the moral and intellectual character of Socrates has furnished material. The subject is one, the detailed treatment of which, in so far as properly within the scope of this history, belongs to another place. Our present object is to consider, not so much what Socrates really was, as what Xenophon has represented him to be.

as con-
ceived by
Xenophon

In any attempt to form, by reference to the two standard sources of authentic information, the texts of Plato and Xenophon, a correct estimate of their master's character, we are met at the outset by a broad, and to all appearance irreconcilable discrepancy between those authorities, on a point of fundamental importance. Xenophon describes Socrates as a man of great integrity and simplicity of manners, of sound judgment and competent acquirements, who devoted his time to inculcating the moral and social duties, in homely, but ingenious forms of instruction; but who condemned the higher

¹ I. vi. sqq., II.—IV.

² IV. viii.

branches of learning, and all speculative philosophy, as unprofitable, or even mischievous pursuits. Plato represents him, not only as distinguished by the same purity of life, but as a sage, whose comprehensive genius embraced, or appreciated all science, from the sublimest mysteries of natural religion or ideal metaphysics, to those practical objects and occupations, which with Xenophon constitute his sole or chief range of instruction.

and by
Plato.

The extent to which the Socrates of Xenophon carried his disapproval of those studies and speculations, in which Plato represents his Socrates as habitually engaged, appears from the following passage of the *Memorabilia* :

7. "He recommended the study of geometry, in so far as necessary for the measurement and division of land, which amount of knowledge might easily be acquired by observation and practice. But he discouraged the more difficult branches of the science, although not himself unversed in them, as of no practical value, and their cultivation as an obstruction to other more useful pursuits. He approved of such an amount of astronomical knowledge, as would enable a man to calculate the periodical returns of the years, seasons, and months, or the length of the nights and days, as being useful in navigation, on military service, and in other necessary business ; and to this extent any one might qualify himself, by conversing with professional nightwatchers, pilots, or other persons to whom such knowledge was indispensable ; but to the study of astronomy in the higher sense, as directed to the position and motions of the heavenly bodies, the orbits of the planets and comets, the lengths or causes of their periodical revolutions, with their distances from the earth, he altogether objected. He declared his inability to perceive the advantage of such researches (though not himself a stranger to them) ; while their pursuit was calculated, he thought, to engross a man's whole life, to the detriment of other better occupations. He also discouraged all speculations regarding the nature of the deity or his functions, as mysteries unfathomable to human minds ; nor, he thought, was it respectful to the gods, for men to pry into what the gods had not themselves vouchsafed to

His range
of scientific
instruc-
tion.

make known. He considered those whose heads were occupied with such things to be in danger of disordering their intellects; as happened to Aristagoras, the man who claimed to have speculated most profoundly on the attributes of the gods. . . .¹ Nor was he ever heard to discuss those much vexed questions, as to how what the sophists call the universe was held together, or how the celestial system was regulated. Those given to speculations of this kind he looked upon as beside themselves, . . . some supposing that physical existence was but one, others that it comprised an infinite number of elements; some that all things were in continual motion, others that nothing ever moved; some that all things were in turn created and annihilated, others that nothing was ever either created or destroyed. 'What,' he was accustomed to ask, 'would they make of this superhuman science if they possessed it? Do they think to turn it to account, as other men do sounder knowledge, in conjuring up at their pleasure such winds, or rains, or changes of season as they may wish for? Or would they be satisfied with simply knowing how these various things are ordered?' "²

This series of doctrines and definitions would indeed restrict within a very narrow compass, the sphere of instruction in the first philosophical school of Athens, together with the range of intellect or liberal thought in the author of the restriction. Every sentence of it is however, directly or indirectly, belied by Socrates himself in the Dialogues of Plato. It is not easy therefore to escape the conclusion that he has been misrepresented by one or other of his disciples. While apart from this difference in their range of scientific research, there is in some other respects a general resemblance between the Platonic and the Xenophontean Socrates, in their eccentric simplicity of habits, in their mode of teaching, in their independence and integrity of life, the one is in every respect a greatly inferior being to the

¹ iv. vii. 2. sqq.² i. i. 11. 14. sqq.

other; inferior in his religious views, in his intellectual powers, in his rhetorical faculty, in his moral conduct. Were we indeed to form our judgement solely on the descriptive portion of the *Memorabilia*, Socrates would be far from wanting in the fundamental attributes of a wise and good man. By Xenophon as by Plato he is described, within the more limited range of genius conceded to him, as faultless in his philosophy, his piety, his moral sentiment. But here, as commonly happens with Xenophon's objects of hero-worship, there is a lamentable discrepancy between the descriptive and the dramatic element of his ethic portraiture. It is when the Xenophontean Socrates is introduced acting and speaking for himself, that he not only appears sadly inferior to the Platonic Socrates, but degenerates, to use the mildest phrase, into a very ordinary being. The dialogues in which he expounds his doctrines, are rarely distinguished either by sound argument or persuasive oratory. Not a few are sophistical to a degree, which would go far to establish the charge brought against him by his enemies, of being ready as it suited his convenience to take either side of a question. He is in fact introduced in different discourses, advocating and demonstrating, to Xenophon's satisfaction it must be presumed, diametrically opposite opinions.¹ Some of these discussions have no other apparent object, but to bewilder and perplex the opposite disputant²; in some his opponent has the best of the argument.³ Many are altogether pointless; descanting in trivial circumstantiality of detail

¹ Appendix Q. No. 1.² Appendix Q. No. 2.³ Appendix Q. No. 3.

on totally uninteresting topics. Such are most of his lectures on the humbler pursuits and occupations of life. One or two specimens are here subjoined :

“Entering the shop of an armourer called Pistias, and having been shown some cuirasses of fine workmanship, ‘By Juno, Pistias,’ said he, ‘this is a noble invention, which hath devised a protection for the exposed parts of the body, without preventing the free use of the arms. But tell me, how is it that, without either making your cuirasses stronger, or of richer material than do other artists, you obtain a higher price for them?’ ‘Because, O Socrates, I make them of better proportion.’ ‘How do you estimate this exactness of proportion? does it depend chiefly on the weight, or on the measure? For I presume you do not make them all of the same size and form, if you wish them to fit well.’ ‘Fit well they must,’ said Pistias; ‘otherwise, by Jupiter, a cuirass would be very little worth.’ ‘But are not some men’s bodies well proportioned, and others ill proportioned?’ ‘To be sure they are.’ ‘How then do you manage to adapt a well proportioned cuirass to an ill proportioned body?’ ‘By making it fit; for proportion in a cuirass, consists in fact in its fitting.’ ‘You are not then speaking of proportion in the abstract, but in reference to the man who uses the armour; as if one were to say, that a shield is well proportioned in so far as it suits its bearer, and the same with a cloak, and many other things. There are also perhaps other advantages in a thing fitting well.’ ‘Say on, Socrates, if anything further occurs to you.’ ‘The weight of a cuirass that fits well is much less felt than that of one which fits ill. Those which fit ill, by either hanging altogether on the shoulder, or galling other parts of the body, are cumbersome and oppressive. But those that fit well, having their weight properly distributed, part on the neck and shoulders, part on the breast, part on the back, part on the belly, appear almost like portions of the body rather than burthens on it.’ ‘It is in these respects that I consider my cuirasses chiefly valuable. Some people care little what a cuirass is, if it is richly gilt and enamelled.’ ‘Truly if they buy on this account cuirasses that don’t fit, they seem to me to buy but a gilt and enamelled nuisance. But since the body does not remain in the same position, being sometimes erect, sometimes bent, a cuirass made to sit very close could hardly be a good fit.’ ‘Certainly not.’ ‘You would say then that it is not the cuirass that sits closest, but the one which is

least oppressive in use, that fits the best.' 'That is what I would say, Socrates; and you evidently understand my meaning.'"¹

"On some one remarking that the water in his well was too warm to be pleasant for drinking; 'If so,' said Socrates, 'you will at least have a warm bath at hand, when in want of one.' 'But it is rather too cold for warm bathing.' 'Do your servants complain of its being unfit either for drinking or bathing.' 'Not at all. Indeed I have often wondered at their putting up so well with it for both purposes.' 'Which is the warmest, the water in your house, or that in the temple of Æsculapius?' 'That in the temple.' 'Beware then of being more difficult to please than servants or sick people.'"²

"Hearing some one, about to visit Olympia, complain of the length and fatigue of the journey: 'You have no cause to be uneasy,' said Socrates. 'Are you not in the habit, when at home, of walking about the greater part of the day? In like manner, when on the road, you will walk before dinner, and before supper, and before going to bed? The walks you take in five or six days when at home, if extended in one line, would easily bring you from Athens to Olympia. But you had better start a day sooner than necessary, rather than a day later. It is severe on a traveller to make journeys of extra length; while a day to spare may greatly alleviate the fatigue. It were wise therefore rather to accelerate your departure, than be hurried on the road.'"³

It is quite possible that a philosopher, even of superior order to Xenophon's Socrates, might, in careless gossiping mood, deliver himself to the above effect. But that Xenophon should have transmitted to posterity such trivial stuff, in a series of choice illustrations of his favourite sage's wisdom and persuasive eloquence, is as discreditable to himself as injurious to the honour of his master. The natural inference must be, that he had nothing better to fill the place allotted to it. But, in truth, there is so much analogy between these passages and other specimens of solemn trifling in the *Cyropædia*, for which Xenophon him-

¹ III. x. 9. sq.

² III. xiii. 3. sq.

³ III. xiii. 5.

self is responsible, as to awaken the suspicion, that he has here made his master, like Cyrus or Chrysantas, merely the mouthpiece of his own conceptions.

Among the few passages of the *Memorabilia*, distinguished by eloquence or philosophical spirit, one is the discourse on the evidence of a deity, as displayed in the more beautiful and beneficial phenomena of the universe.¹ Another is the Allegory of Hercules at the crossroad.² This discourse Socrates, or Xenophon as acting for him, has not disdained to borrow, partly it would appear in the original author's words, from Prodicus, a distinguished member of that order of fellow-teachers whom, under the name of Sophists, Plato represents his master as habitually holding up to ridicule.

His moral
sentiment
and disci-
pline.

8. It is however in his moral attributes, that the defects of Xenophon's Socrates, as portrayed by his own words and acts, are most painfully perceptible. Among his virtues chiefly commended by Xenophon, is his continence in regard to sexual intercourse; a virtue which he is also made, in serious didactic mood, emphatically to inculcate on his disciples. But the effect of these lessons is sadly counteracted, by the morbid satisfaction with which he is habitually introduced discussing the most offensive forms of the vice he professes to deprecate, on those social occasions, where evil example in a senior and professing sage, must be far more effectual in encouraging profligacy, than volumes of formal disquisition in promoting virtuous habits. Illicit amorous intercourse, especially of the kind most repugnant to modern taste, is the favourite topic of the Socratic circle. The Philoso-

¹ IV. iii.

² II. i. 21.

pher, when he does not himself introduce the subject, is always ready to join in it, and too often in a tone of levity, which it is difficult to believe could, even according to the ethic standard of that age, have been consistent with respectability in an elderly Athenian citizen and father of a family. But this levity is not confined to language. The same Xenophon, who asserts in his own words the immaculate purity of his master, makes his master himself admit, in facetious vein, but with too much appearance of sincerity, that he sinned at times, in deed as well as in word, against the doctrines which he preached.

The person who appears in Xenophon's Socratic commentaries, as the favourite disciple and associate of the philosopher, is a certain Critobulus. This youth, unlike those whom other authorities describe as enjoying the highest place in his master's esteem, Alcibiades, Critias, Plato, or Xenophon himself, is altogether devoid, not only of great or good qualities, but of any talent or accomplishment. He is remarkable for nothing but his beauty and his pæderastian profligacy.¹ The philosopher informs us² that Crito, the father of the young voluptuary, had consigned him to his care, for the purpose of being reclaimed from his vicious courses; and the semblance of Mentor is occasionally maintained by a gentle rebuke, to the effect of which an antidote is speedily administered, by the indirect encouragement which the philosopher habitually holds out to perseverance in the fault reprehended.³ Of the two occasions where Socrates, in the *Memorabilia*, reproves a disciple for irregular conduct, one is⁴

¹ *Memor.* i. iii. 8. *sqq.*; *Sympos.* iii. 7., iv. 10. *sqq.*

² *Sympos.* iv. 24.

³ Compare *Sympos.* iv. 21. *sqq.* 27. *sqq.*

⁴ i. iii. 8.

where he taxes Critobulus with having taken an improper liberty with a youth whom he admired; the other¹ where he remonstrates with Critias on behaviour, described by himself as "swinish," towards a younger fellow-pupil. In the festive dialogue of the Symposium, Xenophon makes Socrates jocosely allude to his former censure of Critobulus; when a friend of the latter retorts on the philosopher, that such prudery but ill became him, as he had himself lately been seen acting towards Critobulus, in the same manner for which he had reproved Critias. Socrates admits the justice of this accusation, and laments, in a tragi-comic tone of remorse, his having indeed on that occasion succumbed to the "swinish" influence; but protests that he had since done penance for his fault. Then, turning to Critobulus, he adds: "I now therefore charge you, before these witnesses, never again to come into close personal contact with me, until the hair of your beard shall be equal in length to that of your head." "In this way," as Xenophon winds up the anecdote, "they went on sporting and jesting with each other."² This illustration of his master's moral purity receives its finishing touch, from the incidental allusion by Socrates in the course of the dialogue, to the fact, that Critobulus was a newly married man.³

Nor is it on convivial occasions alone, that Socrates is introduced by Xenophon, abetting immorality. Among the didactic dialogues of the Memorabilia, is one between the philosopher and an itinerant courtesan, of the more licentious class of her profession. It having been mentioned to Socrates that this adven-

¹ I. ii. 30.

² Symp. iv. 27. sq.

³ Symp. II. 3.

turess, by name Theodota, then on a visit to Athens, was very handsome, and her lodging much frequented by artists for the purpose of modelling the more striking beauties of her person, he proceeds, surrounded by his pupils, to make her acquaintance.¹ The reader, whose impressions of his character are derived from other more ideal portraits, will naturally suppose, that his object was to reclaim her from her vicious course of life. But on entering he informs her, in highly complimentary terms, that he visits her, as he was in the habit of visiting other professional persons, for the purpose, by his advice and instructions, of improving her skill and promoting her success in her calling. He accordingly, in most untranslatably offensive detail, explains his views of the best modes of turning her allurements, both of body and mind, to account, in securing and maintaining her hold on her victims. At the close of the interview Theodota, expressing her gratitude, proposes, naturally, that he would afford her opportunities, in his own person, of showing how well she had profited by his lecture. But, while admitting that she had inspired him with a desire to partake of her favours, he excuses himself on the ground of having more important business on hand. All this passes in the presence of those young friends, whom his biographer describes him as habitually warning against the fascinations of vice and vicious companions. If Xenophon's report of this extraordinary interview be correct, whatever may have been the harshness of the punishment, it would be difficult to impugn the justice of the verdict, which pronounced Socrates "a corrupter of the Athenian youth."

¹ III. xi.

THE APOLOGY OF SOCRATES.

How far
genuine.

The tract entitled *Apology of Socrates*, which forms a sort of appendix, or epilogue to the *Memorabilia*, contains reports of conversations held by the philosopher with his friends, before and after his trial, with portions of his defence in court. It is made up in great part of passages of the *Memorabilia*, some repeated word for word, others slightly varied. Its claims to rank as a genuine production of Xenophon have been questioned by modern commentators, and not without reason.¹ It is difficult to see what object Xenophon could have had, in throwing together so small a quantity of original matter as is here contained, into a separate form, rather than uniting it with the more complete biographical treatise to which it so naturally belonged; still less why he should have done so at the cost of so much plagiarism from the text of that treatise. The identity between passages of the *Hellenica* and the *Agexilaus*, offers it is true a parallel, but not altogether a similar case; those two works being different in their general character, although the subject of each admitted of certain portions of the one being equally well adapted to the other. Yet it is perhaps even less likely that a literary forger, qualified so well to imitate the style of Xenophon in the greater part of his supposititious text, would have thought it worth while to mar the original effect of that part, by the admixture of so much palpably stolen matter.²

¹ See L. Schmitz, in the *Cambr. Philolog. Museum*, vol. II. p. 221.

² See Weiske, *Xenoph. Opp.* i. iv. p. 410.; Bornemann, *De Xen. Apol. Socratis*.

THE SYMPOSIUM (CONVIVIUM, OR BANQUET).

9. In the foregoing remarks on Xenophon's portrait of Socrates, regard has been had to the contents, not only of the *Memorabilia*, but of the *Symposium* or *Banquet* by the same author; to which latter work attention is now more especially directed. The illustrations which this curious narrative supplies, of the weaker points of the philosopher's character as conceived by Xenophon, are still more pointed than those derived from the *Memorabilia*.

The class of composition to which the *Symposium* belongs, became popular in Greece at an early period. An elegant fragment of a lost work of the kind, but apparently in superior style, by Ion of Chios, has been quoted in the previous volume.¹ The tract of Xenophon here under consideration, and another under the same title by his fellow-disciple Plato, are the most antient which we now possess.²

The object of Xenophon in the composition of his *Symposium* is to illustrate, partly the tone of convivial society in the Athenian literary circles, chiefly the genius of his master, as exhibited in a variety of forms, such as it could with less propriety be made to assume in his graver biographical commentaries. Socrates accordingly is the principal actor in the piece. The scenes described are little to the honour of any

Plan of
the work.

¹ Vol. IV. p. 207.

² Their respective claims to priority, have been disputed among commentators; and an argument in favour of each has been grounded on the existence in its text of indirect references to the contents of its rival. Certain remarks or allusions are, it is true, common to both; but no clear evidence has yet been adduced, that these passages have in either case been borrowed by the one from the other. Schneid. *De Conviv. Xenoph.* tom. v. p. 140. sqq.; K. F. Hermann, *Philologus*, Götting. 1853, p. 320.

Part
allotted to
Socrates.

of the performers. But the part allotted to Socrates is, in all respects, so unworthy either of a wise and virtuous man, or of a man of ordinary taste and judgment, that were the real authorship less clearly ascertained, one might suppose the work to be an insidious attempt by some Aristophanic libeller, under the mask of an admirer, to hold the philosopher up to ridicule. The moral discourses by which he is made from time to time to season the general levity of the proceedings, would serve, by the pedantic drollery of the contrast, to impart additional zest to the satire.

The banquet described is represented as having been given by Callias, a distinguished Athenian citizen, in the year 421—420 B.C., to Autolycus, a youth of whom he was enamoured, in honour of a victory gained by the same Autolycus in the Pancratian contest "of the Boys," in the Panathenæa of that year.¹ The company comprised, besides Autolycus and Callias, Lycon, the father of Autolycus; Niceratus, son of Nicias, the same probably slain by the Thirty tyrants²; Socrates, with his favourite Critobulus, and four other pupils: Xenophon; Antisthenes, afterwards founder of the sect of Cynics; Hermogenes, brother of Callias; and Charmides, a cousin and partisan of Critias, who fell, together with his patron, in the battle of the Piræus.³ The fact of Autolycus having been victor in the Panathenæa of this year is certain. How far the banquet in celebration of his victory may have been a real event is open to question. The introduction of real personages in a composition of this kind, acting imaginary parts, in connexion with real transactions, was quite compatible with literary privilege

¹ Conf. Schneid. De Conv. Xenoph. p. 143. sqq.

² Hellen. II. iii. 30. Schn. ad loc.

³ Hellen. II. iv. 19.

in that age as in our own. Nor would the ethic value of the piece be materially diminished by such a want of historical substance. As at the supposed date of the banquet, Xenophon, like Autolycus, was a youth of about fifteen, he could hardly have been qualified very accurately to observe or commit to memory the details of what took place. Nor consequently would his narrative, even if in so far founded on fact, have afforded a better illustration of the men and manners described, than a similar composition, the framework of which alone was imaginary, while the characters were drawn from the real life by one well acquainted with their peculiarities.

In the subjoined epitome, several of the more characteristic passages have, for the sake of closer illustration, been cited in their integrity.

Epitome of
its con-
tents.

Soon after the guests were assembled, a professional jester named Philippus knocks at the door, and in a humorous tone of supplication, asks and obtains permission to enter and partake of the feast. His attempts to promote mirth are long unsuccessful; the stupor of admiration into which the company had been thrown by the beauty of the principal guest, having rendered them callous to his jokes. In the end, his burlesque mode of showing his mortification provokes a certain degree of hilarity.¹ Supper being ended and the tables removed, a Syracusan ballet-master is introduced with a small troop of choristers, consisting of his own son and two females, proficient in music and dancing. Their inaugural performance is much admired, and Socrates compliments Callias on the excellence of his entertainment. A proposal is made to distribute perfumes among the company. But to this Socrates objects. He argues, that such luxuries ought to be appropriated to women; that the oil of the Gymnasium was the only cosmetic which became a man, and that the most fragrant of all perfumes was the odour of a virtuous life. The performance of several dances by one of the girls, elicits from Socrates a remark on the comparative genius of the male and female sex², which An-

The
jester.

The
Syracusan
ballet-
master.

¹ c. i.

² ii. 1—4.

tisthenes follows up by rallying the philosopher on the particular genius of his wife Xantippe. Socrates in reply, argues, that to a man of philosophic mind there are great advantages in a cross-tempered wife. Congratulating the Syracusan on the skill of his performers, he expresses his intention of learning some steps himself from so accomplished a master. The burst of laughter which follows this announcement, provokes from Socrates a dissertation on the utility of all kinds of athletic exercises, and not least of dancing, to men of every class and age. Callias admits the truth of this doctrine, and promises, as soon as the philosopher begins his lessons, to become his fellow-pupil.¹

"Pander-
ism" of
Socrates.

Philippus mimics with good effect the gestures of the dancers. On his complaining of thirst, the cup is handed round; when Socrates moralises on the various influences of wine, for good or for evil, on the minds of men, which he likens to the influences of rain on the vegetable world.² Callias, on the suggestion of Socrates, gives a more intellectual turn to the entertainment, by proposing that each guest shall describe the talent on which he chiefly prides himself. He sets the example by stating, that he considers himself to excel in the art of improving men's characters. Niceratus boasts of his knowledge of Homer; Critobulus of his beauty; Antisthenes, after cavilling at some of the previous answers, of his wealth; Charmides of his poverty; Socrates, with great dignity of manner, of his skill as a pander, or go-between. He declares, amid the general mirth of the company, that he feels confident, were he to devote himself to that profession, he would soon realise a good fortune. Lycon prides himself on the victory of his son; Hermogenes on the possession of many friends.³ Socrates then insists that each man shall give a nearer definition of his boasted quality, and of the grounds on which he rests his claim. Callias explains, that his mode of rendering men better is to give them money; those who have something to spend, being least under temptation to steal. Niceratus, among other beauties of his favourite poet, commends the passage in which he prescribes an onion as a good relish for drink; and proposes that some should be handed round. Charmides remarks, that Niceratus naturally wishes to smell of onion, in order that his wife, on his return home, may not suspect him of having been kissing other people.⁴ Critobulus then enlarges, with enthusiastic eloquence, on his zeal and success in the pursuit of his amours, on his own personal charms, and on those of

¹ ii. 9—20.

² ii. 21—iii. 3.

³ iii. 4—14.

⁴ iv. 1—9.

Clinias, the youth whom he chiefly loves. Socrates boldly denies his title to the palm of beauty, asserts his own preferable claim, and calls on the company to decide between them. In the discussion which follows this challenge, Socrates taxes Critobulus with indulging in impure love ; but is forced in his turn to admit, that his own amorous inclinations are not always confined within the just limits prescribed by himself in his lectures.¹

Charmides, expatiating on the blessings of poverty, describes how much happier a man he had been since he had been ruined by the war, than when in the possession of extensive estates. Antisthenes defines the wealth of which he boasts, to be identical with the poverty of Charmides, consisting of a bare competence with contentment. Hermogenes explains the friends in whose favour he glories, to be the gods, and is commended by Socrates for his piety. The philosopher also defines the figurative sense in which he boasted of his qualifications as a pander.²

The contest for the palm of beauty between Socrates and Critobulus now commences. Subjoined are the chief points of the philosopher's case, as argued in his favourite inductive method :

His competition for the palm of beauty.

Socr. Do you consider beauty to be a property of men alone, or common to other objects?

Crit. By Jupiter, I think a horse or an ox may also be beautiful, and a sword, or a shield, or a spear, and many other things.

Socr. But how can all these things be beautiful, being all unlike each other ?

Crit. They are beautiful, in as far as they are so born, or so formed, as to be best adapted each to its particular purpose.

Socr. For what purpose are man's eyes required ?

Crit. For the purpose of seeing.

Socr. Then my eyes must be more beautiful than yours.

Crit. How so ?

Socr. Because yours can only see straight forwards, while mine squint all around.

Crit. You must admit then that a crab has, of all animals, the most beautiful eyes.

Socr. No doubt ; because she has the best and strongest.

Crit. Be it so. And do you also consider your nose to be the handsomer of the two ?

Socr. Assuredly ; if noses were made by the gods for the pur-

¹ iv. 10—28. : conf. p. 450. *supra*.

² iv. 29. *sqq.*

pose of smelling. For your nostrils are turned down towards the ground, while mine are widely spread out, so as to collect odours from all sides.

Crit. In what other respect is a snub nose handsomer than a straight one?

Socr. Because it does not obstruct the view from the eyes, but allows them a clear look out; while a high nose is like a hostile rampart in front of them.

Crit. With regard to the mouth I give up my case; for as mouths were made for biting, yours I admit is much better at that than mine.

Socr. But do you not also think, that my lips being so much thicker, my kiss must be much softer than yours?"

In spite however of this ingenious argument, the case is decided in favour of Critobulus, who receives as the prize of his victory the kisses of the company.¹

His altercation with Hermogenes,

Hermogenes having, during a long interval, taken no part in the conversation, is chid by Socrates for his silence; when the following altercation ensues:

"*Socr.* Can you tell me, Hermogenes, what it is 'to be the worse for wine?'

Herm. If you ask me what it is, I don't know. But I can tell you what I think it is.

Socr. Well, let us hear.

Herm. I consider a man to be the worse for wine, who bores a friend while enjoying his wine.

Socr. Do you not bore us by your silence?

Herm. While you yourselves are talking?

Socr. No; but when we stop, and your turn comes.

Herm. Do you think it would have been possible for me to squeeze in half a syllable, much less a whole remark, during the intervals of your talk?

Socr. Callias! Can't you help a man who is getting a set down?

Cal. I will do my best. Were we not silent while the flute was playing?

Herm. Would you have had me mar the music with my voice, as Nicostratus the actor does, when spouting his tetrameters? . . ."

and with

Socrates is now, in his turn, attacked by the Syracusan, whom

¹ v.—vi. l.

he had offended by diverting the attention of the company from his choric entertainments to sophistical discourses. the ballet-master.

"*Syr.* Are you Socrates, called the Thinker?

Socr. Better to be called the Thinker than the Thoughtless.

Syr. Not when a man's thoughts are always up in the air.

Socr. Can a man's thoughts be too lofty when they are fixed on the gods?

Syr. But your thoughts, by Jupiter, as I am told, are altogether visionary.

Socr. If visionary, they may well be fixed on the gods, to whom we owe both vision and provision.¹ If my wit is shallow, you have yourself to blame for provoking it.

Syr. Leave this trifling, and tell me: How many lengths of a flea's foot are there betwixt you and me? for that they say is the kind of geometry in which you excel."

Antisthenes and Philippus interpose, and the altercation becomes general. Socrates calms the excitement by commencing a song, and the rest join in chorus; after which he allays the wrath of the ballet-master, by a learned commentary on the conjuring tricks performed by the troop.² He then, in support of his boasted office of Pander, expatiates with much eloquence on the passion of love, illustrating his subject by examples drawn from history, human and divine. He compares the attributes and rites of the Aphrodite Urania, or Celestial Venus, who presides over the love of the mind, with those of the Aphrodite Pandemus, or Material Venus, who presides over the love of the body. He warmly advocates the claims of the former, and repudiates those of the rival goddess to the worship of her votaries.³ His lecture on love.

The solemnity of this lecture is relieved, and the entertainment concluded, by a pantomimic dance of the Syracusan choristers, representing the consummation of the marriage rite of Bacchus and Ariadne. A graphic, but not very chaste description is given, of the effect produced by this performance on the younger members of the company.⁴ Lascivious dance.

10. From the parallel between this description and that given by Plato of his Socratic banquet, it may be inferred that Xenophon has here represented, more Parallel of Plato's Symposium.

¹ The pun in the text is not literally translatable; but we venture to think that our own free copy is not worse than the original.

² vi. 6. sqq., vii.

³ viii.—ix.

⁴ ix. 2. sqq.

Xenophon's facetious humour.

or less faithfully, the general plan of such entertainments in the Athenian literary circles. The further inference however, that the peculiar vein of conversational wit which enlivens his Symposium, was prevalent in polite Athenian society, is not borne out by other evidence ; neither by that of the same Platonic convivium and of the fragment of Ion already cited, nor by those remains of the Athenian comic drama which reflect the more chaste and classical, as distinct from the popular Attic taste ; nor generally, by the allusions which occur in classical literature to such convivial meetings. In the Platonic banquet the tone, even of Aristophanes, when treating too a not very delicate subject, is comparatively subdued and delicate. That much of the wit of the Xenophontean banquet is Xenophon's own, is further implied by the near resemblance which portions of it bear to parallel specimens in his other works. With the Socratic definition of beauty above quoted, may be compared the discussion in the *Cyropædia* between Cyrus and his officers on the subject of matrimony.¹ The Persian hero's boast of his skill in match-making, also finds its parallel in the philosopher's pride in his panderism. Xenophon's humour indeed, everywhere savours more of the camp life of his maturer years, than of the Periclean polite society in which he passed his youth. There can also be little doubt that, in so far as his taste was formed on classic models, the one preferred was Aristophanes. The case of direct plagiarism from the *Clouds*, in the philosopher's quarrel with the ballet-master, did it stand alone, might not supply ground for any positive inference.

¹ p. 408. *supra*.

But the Xenophontean wit is generally of the Aristophanic order; broad and palpable, often obscene; abounding in personal allusions and punning repartees. We miss however the power, brilliancy, and ease of Aristophanes. Xenophon's humour everywhere bears the stamp of effort. His jokes with rare exception are flat; his puns farfetched; his repartee laboured and artificial, degenerating at times into mere trivial commonplace. The passages above cited have been selected as fair average specimens; and as being free from that excess of indelicacy, which renders others, especially when placed in the mouth of Socrates, unfit for citation.¹

Of the graver passages interspersed here and there, the most effective are, the joint dissertations of Charmides and Antisthenes on the Blessings of poverty, and that of Socrates on Love. The two younger moralists recapitulate with some spirit, the usual arguments in favour of their Utopian paradox. The merits of the philosopher's disquisition are placed in a great degree, by the very nature of its subject, beyond the reach of modern criticism; the species of amorous affection to which it exclusively relates, being one repudiated by modern taste and morality, as hardly fit for discussion either in polite conversation or in writing. Admitting however, in its full extent, the dignity and propriety of his line of argument, as judged in the spirit of his own times, the broader becomes the contrast between his doctrine and the part he is made to perform in the previous scenes. A stranger anomaly can hardly be imagined than that with which Xenophon has here, unconsciously

¹ Conf. iv. 53. sqq.

it would seem, presented his readers; by introducing the same man, during a whole afternoon, taking part in licentious discourse, enjoying lascivious dances, and jocosely alluding to his own lascivious acts, and then concluding the day's entertainment by an elaborate lecture on the beauty and advantage of moral purity.

THE ŒCONOMIST, OR HOUSEHOLDER.¹

11. This treatise comprises two separate dialogues. The first is between Socrates and his favourite pupil Critobulus. The second is a recapitulation, by the philosopher, of one formerly held by himself with a friend called Ischomachus. In the former Socrates is, as usual, the instructor. In the latter this duty is performed by Ischomachus, and Socrates is the supposed listener.

Athenian
system of
house-
keeping.

The subject of discussion is domestic economy, or, in the literal sense of the Greek phrase, Housekeeping; which, for reasons assigned by Socrates, is made to comprehend agriculture. In the first dialogue, the philosopher takes a general view of the combined topics. He commences by defining in the usual interrogatory form, the term Œconomy, or Housekeeping. Then follows a disquisition on the origin, nature, and value of property, its use and abuse; with more immediate reference to the circumstances of himself and his friend; to the proverbial wealth of Critobulus, and his own poverty.² He then undertakes, at the request of Critobulus, a special application of what has been said to the case of the latter.

¹ The original title *Οἰκονομικός*, like that of *Ἰππαρχικός* in the sequel (p. 471.), depends on the noun *λόγος* understood. We have given to each a turn better adapted to our own idiom.

² i. ii.

He impresses on him the propriety of making a better use of his riches, of introducing order into his domestic arrangements, and of assigning to his wife, hitherto a mere cipher in his estimation, her proper position in his establishment. He commends agriculture, as the only one among the industrial arts worthy of being cultivated by a free and warlike people.

In the sequel he disclaims any such knowledge of the details of domestic economy, as could qualify him properly to instruct others. He therefore has recourse to his recollection of a series of lessons formerly delivered to himself by his friend Ischomachus, one of the best citizens and most accomplished men of business in Athens.¹

Ischomachus enjoins, as the first step in the formation of a domestic establishment, the acquisition of a virtuous and prudent wife. He describes how he had trained his own, at the time when he espoused her an inexperienced girl of fourteen, to the duties of her position. The account that ensues of the functions of an Athenian married lady, would be applicable, if we except the greater restriction on her personal liberty, to a hired housekeeper of the present day. Her business is to nurse her children, to maintain discipline among her slaves; to be diligent herself at her web, in the management of her kitchen, larder, and bakehouse, and in her care of the furniture, wardrobe, and household property of all kinds; to select a well qualified stewardess to act under herself, but to allow no undue confidence in her to interfere with her own habits of personal superintendence; to remain continually within doors;

¹ iii.—vi.

she will find abundance of exercise in her walks to and from different parts of the premises, in dusting clothes and carpets, and baking bread or pastry.¹ From all this it appears, that what are now considered essential qualifications in a married lady of the upper class, presiding at her husband's table, receiving his guests, or enlivening by her conversation his hours of domestic retirement, entered as little into the philosopher's estimate of a model wife, as into that of his countrymen at large. Like Pericles, Socrates, according to Xenophon, could appreciate female accomplishment in an Aspasia or a Theodota, but was not, like Pericles, alive to their value in a virtuous Athenian lady.

Athenian
system of
agricul-
ture.

Passing on to the agricultural branch of his subject, Ischomachus first enjoins the obtaining a good land-steward, as being to the farm what a good wife is to the house. He considers it better for a landlord to train one for himself, than purchase one in the market; all the members of the establishment being, it would seem, of the servile order. In the management of his hinds and labourers, leniency is enjoined as preferable to harshness; reward for good conduct as more effectual than severity against offenders. The different qualities of soils are then examined, in their adaptation to different kinds of produce. The proper seasons and modes of ploughing, sowing, harrowing, weeding, reaping, threshing, winnowing, are prescribed. Similar directions are given for the culture of olives, vines, and figs. The essay concludes with an exhortation to diligence and thrift in every branch of management, as more important even than skill; there being more cases of bankruptcy among

¹ vii.—x.

skilled agriculturists deficient in the former requisites, than among careful husbandmen of inferior science.¹

The part of this dialogue devoted to domestic economy, or housekeeping in the proper sense, is the most copious; and comprises all the more fundamental principles of that art, in so far as reducible to written rules. The agricultural commentaries are less detailed. No distinction is made between the different kinds of culture adapted to different species of grain, or to those numerous other vegetables, which, then assuredly as now, formed a large proportion of the sum total of agricultural produce in Southern Europe. The directions as to ploughing, sowing, reaping, &c., are given in the aggregate, without distinction of the different seasons or modes, adapted to different kinds of produce. Wheat and barley alone are mentioned; nothing is said of lentils, millet, beans, pease, hemp. As little of sheep-husbandry, the cow, or the dairy. The rules for planting olives and vines are more specific. No remarks occur on the several kinds of agricultural implement. Manure is mentioned, as a necessary aid to growth; but no directions are given for the mode of its application to different soils or crops.

The style, in the more practical parts of the dialogue, is concise and to the purpose, but at times not free from the characteristic diffuseness of Socratic dialectics. The excursions on the Persian system of agricultural policy, and on the character and death of the younger Cyrus², are undue excrescences on the text of a short didactic essay. In the one last mentioned, Xenophon indirectly describes this dialogue as held, or as feigned by him to have been

¹ xii.—xxi.

² iv. 5. sqq. 16. sqq.

held, in the interval between the death of his Persian patron, in September, 401 B.C., and that of Socrates in June, 399. He has been guilty therefore either of a blunder, or more probably perhaps of a wilful license, in representing himself as present on the occasion. Apart from the general evidence elsewhere adduced, that his return to Athens after his Thracian campaign was prevented by his banishment, his transfer of the Cyreian army from the service of Seuthes to that of Thimbron, did not take place till the summer, or at soonest the spring of the year 399. It is impossible therefore, even had he revisited Athens in time to have found his master alive, that he could have found him freely following his old pursuits. The tract contains no further data for judging of the time of its composition.

The Athenian land-
ed gentleman.

The description by Ischomachus of the ordinary outdoor occupation of an Athenian gentleman, is graphic and characteristic:¹

"I rise in the morning, about the hour when I may count on finding at home any person on whom I have occasion to call, and attend to such business as I may have in the city. This affords me as good a morning walk as I require. If there is nothing to detain me in town, I send my horse and groom into the country, and proceed thither myself on foot; which I consider a better walking exercise than I can have in the city porticoes. On reaching my farm, I inspect any planting, ploughing, sowing, or harvest work, in which my people may happen to be engaged, and suggest any change or improvement in their operations that may occur to me. I then commonly mount my horse, and exercise him and myself, as nearly as may be, in the war practice of the cavalry, sparing no kind of pace or passage, in flank or front, over fence or ditch, unless where the nature of the ground might risk the laming of my charger. My ride being ended, the groom, after resting and cooling him,² leads him home, carrying with him

¹ xi. 14.

² Literally, "allowing him to roll himself:" conf. *De re Equest.* v. 3.

anything that may be required for family use from the farm. I return as I went, on foot; and on reaching the city, repose and clean myself, and partake of a moderate repast."

The supplementary touches in this essay do not improve the moral character of Socrates, as portrayed in the *Memorabilia* or the *Convivium*. Critobulus, in spite of his master's alleged efforts to reclaim him, and though now of the mature age of forty, is described¹ as still an idle man of pleasure; and admits, in reply to a question which Socrates in his usual jocose vein addresses to him, "that his wife was among the "people with whom he had least pleasure in conversing."² The intimacy therefore between him and his preceptor, during the twenty years or upwards that he had remained incorrigible, can hardly be reconciled with the Socratic dogma, so emphatically inculcated in the *Memorabilia*, that it is the duty of a wise and good man to select wise and good men for his associates, and to break off intercourse with those of an opposite character.

ON THE EQUESTRIAN ART.

12. The three remaining works of Xenophon, two on the Equestrian art, the third on the Chase, are among the most carefully composed in the collection, and display a thorough knowledge of the subjects treated. Of the two on equestrian affairs, the second, entitled "*Hipparchicus*," relates to the duties of the Hipparchus, or Commandant of cavalry, in the state of Athens; the first, here more immediately under review, is a manual of the properties and uses of the riding-

¹ ii. 7.

² iii. 12.

horse, and of the qualifications of the judge of horses, the rider, and the groom. The art of farriery is not included; nor that of horsebreaking in the stricter sense, for the reason intimated by the author¹, that it appertains to professional persons rather than the knight, or gentleman cavalier, for whose benefit his work is chiefly intended. The rules laid down, if allowance be made for certain distinctions between antient and modern usage, apply equally well to the present² time. They have, for the most part, been inherited in our own practice, and in various instances are preferable to those now in use.³ Rarely has a subject of so commonplace, yet technical a nature, been treated with greater elegance and spirit, or within the limits prescribed, with greater completeness and accuracy.

The equestrian art had, before the time of Xenophon, supplied material for literary treatment. In the opening passage of this tract, he mentions an author named Simon, to whom he was indebted for useful suggestions embodied in his own text. He arranges his subject under the two general heads of Horse-purchasing⁴, and the use and management of the horse when acquired.⁵ Under the first head he describes the qualities or points of a horse, good or bad; a knowledge of which is essential for the guidance of the buyer. Horses, as marketable objects, are considered as of two classes, young unbroken colts, and animals already trained and fit to carry. The sub-

¹ ii. 2.

² See Berenger's notes to his translation of this tract, in his *History and Art of Horsemanship*, vol. i. p. 219. sqq.

³ Berenger, p. 234. 238, 239.

⁴ i. 1. 2. sqq.

⁵ iv. 1. sqq.

joined remarks on the first class may be taken as a fair sample of the style:¹

“In purchasing a colt, the shape and points are mainly to be considered; the criteria for judging of the temper being, in an unbroken animal, wanting or fallacious. Attention must first be paid to the feet. For as a house would be little worth, however good its upper story, if its foundations were bad, in like manner a charger with bad feet would be of no value, however good its other points. For this one defect would render them all worthless. The part of the foot to be first examined is the hoof. A thick hoof is to be preferred to a thin one, a deep hoof to a shallow one, both in the fore and the hind feet. A deep hoof keeps the frog well off the ground, while in a low flat foot, as in that of a knock-kneed man, the hard and the tender parts are alike exposed to the roughness of the road. It has been well remarked by Simon, that sound is a good test of a horse's foot; for a firm hollow hoof rings like a cymbal on the ground. Proceeding upwards, the pastern, or space between the fetlock and the horn of the hoof, ought not to be over straight or upright, as in the foot of a goat. For the action of a foot so formed is apt to jar the rider in his seat, and cause inflammation of the horse's legs. Neither should that part be too low, for then the fetlock itself is exposed to drag in the mud or among the clods. The leg bones, as the supports of the body, should be thick, but free from flesh, or puffiness in the veins. . .”

Rules for
purchasing
a horse.

In the same lively strain, he analyses the several properties to be approved or condemned, in the knees, the thighs, the breast, neck, head, eyes, nostrils, shoulders, flanks, carcass, loins, coupling, &c.

The rules for purchasing an already broken horse, comprise definitions of the chief qualifications of the rider and the groom, as required for testing by experiment the capacities of the animal. The age having been ascertained by inspection of the teeth, the horse is mounted, and its temper and mouth, its activity and speed, in the several paces, undergo the necessary trials; in the stall and the stable-yard, with

¹ i. 2.

bit, halter, and leading-rein; in the field or on the road, alone or with other horses. In a war horse, as with us in a hunter, further proofs are required of his proficiency in the different kinds of leap, over wall, ditch, or fence, and in his ability to cope with irregular or precipitous ground.¹

His stabling and keep.

Art of equitation.

The horse having been acquired, attention is directed to his lodging and keep, to his feeding, as regards both quality and economy; to his bedding, grooming, and general treatment in the stable.² Passing on to the art of equitation in the proper sense, the author commences with the bridling. This operation is described with a graphic precision of terms, which, in an English version, would be equally intelligible and instructive to an English groom lad. Directions are given for the handling of the bridle, and the formation of the "hand;" light but firm, with slack, or tight rein, as suited to different paces and movements. As stirrups were not used by the Greeks, the act of mounting was performed with more difficulty than now; and, to suit the convenience of different riders, in a variety of modes which, as here described, contrast curiously with our own simple method.³ The Seat is next considered, also, like the Hand, in its adaptation to the different motions of the horse. The directions for sitting a leap, bear obvious reference to contingencies arising from the want of stirrups. Instructions are also given in cavalry skirmishing, and in the sabre and lance exercise. Special rules are given for the management of cross-tempered horses, the one golden precept being steadily kept in view, that everything should be done, where possible, by gentle and persuasive treatment, by coax-

¹ i.—iii.

² iv.—vi. 1—6.

³ vi. 7.—vii. sqq.

ing, humouring, and force of habit; as little as possible by chastisement or coercion.¹ A detailed description follows, of the different kinds of bit, their structure and use, as adapted to different tempers and mouths. The treatise concludes with some account of the best kinds of cavalry armour, for the protection of both horse and man, and of the weapons best adapted for cavalry combat.

In this exposition of the subject, two omissions chiefly strike the modern reader. Nothing is said of the saddle, beyond the mention of its name, and of the fact that such an article was used. No notice is bestowed on its form, material, position, or mode of fastening upon the horse. The chapter on shoeing, of vital importance in the modern book of equitation, is also a blank page in that of Xenophon; the Greek horses not having been shod. Great importance is hence attached, in the description of the stable and stable-yard, to the kinds of pavement best calculated to harden the foot, without impairing its strength and elasticity.

This essay seems, from an allusion at its close, to have been written about the same time with the "Hipparchus;" consequently, as we gather from the internal evidence of the latter treatise, after Xenophon's restoration to his rights of citizenship.

THE HIPPARCHUS, OR COMMANDER OF CAVALRY.

The essay on the Equestrian art closes with the remark, that its contents are chiefly intended for the benefit of private cavaliers. The present treatise applies more especially to the duties of a Hippar-

¹ viii. ix.

thus, or Commandant of cavalry, and is addressed to the person holding that office in Athens, in a friendly confidential tone, indicating a personal intimacy between him and the author.

His first duty is to maintain the muster-roll of his corps, under the powers vested in him by the state for this purpose, at its full legal complement. In selecting his men, from the class liable to cavalry service, those to be preferred in the first instance, are citizens distinguished for rank and wealth; lest, if these were permitted to evade their turn of duty, others of inferior station should have a pretext for holding back. In furtherance of this object, he ought to retain orators to support his interest in the council, by denouncing the recusants, and in other ways influencing the legislature in favour of his claims. Care should be taken that the recruits come provided with good horses; and that all beasts affected with any blemish or vice, especially kickers in the ranks, should be discarded.¹

Detailed instructions are given for the maintenance of both men and horses in a fully efficient state, by judicious discipline in quarters, and regular practice in field evolutions, and martial exercises. Improvements are also suggested in the existing system of cavalry tactics. A large portion of the text is bestowed on the parade duties of the cavalry during the great national festivals, where they contributed to the effect of the ceremonial by the splendour of their appearance, and by the performance of mimic fights, and other manœuvres customary on such occasions.²

Attention is then directed to the graver responsibilities of a commander when on active service; on the

¹ i. 1—15.

² i. 16. sqq., ii. iii.

march through a difficult country, or in presence of the enemy; in reconnoitring, skirmishing, foraging; and in providing for the comforts of the men in camp and quarters. It is suggested, as a measure calculated, for reasons assigned, to promote the efficiency of the service, that the cavalry force of the republic should be augmented to the number of a thousand men, by an addition of two hundred foreign mercenaries to the existing eight hundred Athenians.¹

This essay possesses value as a manual, by an experienced tactician, of the cavalry branch of military service in Athens, about the time of Xenophon's restoration to his civic rights², when that service, judging from his glowing account of the feats of the Athenian horse in the Mantinean campaign, was in a high state of efficiency. How far this may have been owing to Xenophon's suggested improvements we have no means of judging. The style is concise and to the point, but less spirited than that of the sister tract on Horsemanship.

ON HUNTING.³

13. This treatise is not calculated to speak home very powerfully to the sympathies of the British lover of field sports. It were natural to expect, that if Xenophon, who had so long been engaged in that species of human warfare which most nearly resembles the pursuit of ferocious wild animals, were ever led by his love of the chase, to digest his views on the

¹ iv. sq.

² Conf. Krüger, *Hist. Philol. Stud.* II. p. 282.

³ No antient critic has questioned the genuine character of this work. For the usual amount of vague speculation on the subject by modern commentators, see Sauppe, *Præf.* to the 2nd ed. of Schneider's text, tom. VI. p. LVII.

subject in a written form, his illustrations would chiefly have been derived from encounters with the noblest kinds of game; if not with the lion, tiger, or elephant, animals foreign to the soil of Greece, at least with the wolf, the bear, the lynx, and other fiercer denizens of his native forests. This expectation is sustained by the exordium of the book, in which the author panegyrises the art of hunting as an invention of the gods, and enumerates, in brilliant array, the divinities and heroes, who had ennobled it by their achievements. It is hence with some surprise, it may be with some little amusement, that the reader discovers, on penetrating further into the text, that the portion of it occupied with the hunting of the hare, and that in modes, snaring and netting, which an English gentleman sportsman disdains to employ, as the exclusive province of the night poacher, is four times greater than the space allotted to the pursuit of all other animals. The chase of the fallow deer, and that of the wild boar, are described in terms indicating that they were occasionally practised by Xenophon.¹ In his chapter (vi.) on the lion, leopard, panther, bear, "and other such animals," which occupies a single short page, he evidently speaks from hearsay.

Hare-
snaring
and net-
ting.

The functionaries for whom his favourite sport of hare-hunting provides employment are: the snarer or netter; and the huntsman in charge of the dogs, with which the hares are driven into the snares and nets. The qualifications of the former are described

¹ IX. x. Yet in the passage of the *Anabasis*, v. iii. 10., describing the game provided from Xenophon's preserves for the entertainment of his guests, at the festival of Diana, venison and wild boar alone are mentioned, nothing being said of hares.

with much precision. A good snarer must, it is said, "have a natural talent for his business; and a "good knowledge of the Greek tongue; must be "twenty years of age; of light but athletic habit of "body, and cheerful hearty disposition; qualities "which render him both fond of the work, and proof "against the hardships to which it exposes him."¹ Less importance seems to have been attached to the personal attributes of the huntsman; he is merely required to be lightly and loosely clad, well shod, and to carry a staff in his hand.²

The apparatus required in the snarer's department, the filaments, threads, twists, twines, &c., of which the nets and snares are composed; the meshes, cavities, chambers, &c., into which they are subdivided, and the loops, rings, knots, and other mechanism on which they work, are particularised with extreme minuteness, and by a corresponding variety of technical terms. A great part of these are as unintelligible to the modern Greek scholar, as the ideas which they represent, even if vernacularly defined, would probably be to the most accomplished modern poacher.³

Before or about daybreak, the snares and nets are so disposed as to command the outlets of the covert, from which the hares are driven with dogs, hunting by scent, partly in small packs like our beagles or harriers, sometimes separate like ground spaniels.⁴ The hounds employed, their breed, points, and modes of breaking and hunting, their collars, couples, slips, leading-strings, body-cloths,—are described with a diligence similar to that bestowed on the nets and

¹ ii. 3.² vi. 11.³ ii. 4. sqq.⁴ vi. 11. sq.

snares, and displaying a thorough acquaintance with the natural history and habits of the animal. A list is given of towards fifty of the names most appropriate for hounds male and female.¹ In the sequel we have a still more detailed commentary on the natural history and habits of the hare; in the field or the woodlands, the mountain or the marsh, by night or by day, when in form or on the run, in feeding, playing, bucking, breeding, sleeping, waking.²

The snares being set and everything ready, the active operations of the chase, the drawing of the covert, finding the scent, and the actual pursuit of the game, are described with a burst of enthusiasm, contrasting almost ludicrously with the insignificance of the object pursued:

“Off they now go, joyously, heartily, keen on the scent, in twos, in threes, still steadily on, now on this track now on that, ranging here turning there, harking forward trying back, into the thicks, over the clear, through the rough, along the smooth, eager to be first, with tails wagging high, ears flattened down, eyes flashing fire. On nearing the hare, they soon let the huntsman know whereabouts they are, their whole bodies vibrating, as if but a part of their tails; fiercely darting forwards, vying for the lead, now clustering together, again spreading abroad, again dashing on, until at last they approach the form, and rush in upon the hare. Up she springs, and away she starts, the pack in full cry behind her, the huntsman's voice resounding after them, Halloo dogs! fie, fie dogs! steadily again dogs; well done good dogs!” &c.

This sort of description is kept up during several pages, with other mimic specimens of the huntsman's stentorian eloquence, as addressed to the snarer, to the dogs, or to the passing peasant, where a check occurs, or information is required. Directions are also

¹ iii.—v. vi. l. sqq., vii.

² v.

given, as to the proper modification in each case of the tone or key of his voice, loud or moderate, high or low: "Look to her boy, look to her boy; mark her boy; mark her boy; Holloa you there—have you seen the dogs there?" &c.¹

If the game is found, but escapes, the covert is drawn afresh; if unsuccessfully, an attempt is made to regain and follow up the scent of the lost hare in the open field, tire her out, and kill her in the mode of a modern harrier-hunt.² The swiftness of the hare is described as so great, that no dog could cope with her in fair running.³ Coursing accordingly in the modern sense is nowhere mentioned, and may be presumed, with the nobler kind of greyhound, to have been unknown to Xenophon. Tracking in the snow is the only other variation of his favourite sport which he particularises.⁴ Hares, if we may judge from his description, were not plentiful in Greece, at least in his hunting-grounds. Hence possibly may be explained the extraordinary importance attached to their pursuit. "Blank days" are alluded to as not uncommon, and a single hare seems to have been considered as a fair day's sport.⁵

The modes of catching fawns, as described at some length in the sequel, are curious, and different from anything now practised. Full-grown deer are chiefly taken by a peculiar kind of snare or trap, which, remaining fast as a clog on the foot, impedes the animal's course, and enables either dogs or men to track, overtake, and destroy him.⁶ The wild boar, like the hare, is taken by nets, of great size and strength. When well trammelled in the meshes, he is attacked

Deer-catching.

Boar-hunting.

¹ vi. 15. sqq.

² vi. 24. sqq.

³ v. 29.

⁴ viii.

⁵ vi. 24. sqq.

⁶ ix.

and slain by the huntsmen with javelin or spear; not without danger at times to men as well as dogs. The male seems never to have been pursued and engaged in open combat; but the female, being by nature short of wind, is described as frequently killed in this manner, though seldom without the loss of several dogs.¹ Foxes are mentioned, not as objects of field sport, but as an impediment to its enjoyment; as a sort of ground vermin, injurious to the harrier, by drawing him off the legitimate scent; standing therefore in the same relation as the hare with us, in a thickly-stocked game preserve, to the unsteady fox-hound.²

It is remarkable that throughout this treatise, nothing is said of what in modern times is considered the noblest form of the chase, hunting on horseback; nothing of the capture of any kind of winged game; nothing of the use of the bow and arrow; although these in the Greek heroic legends, are described as favourite weapons of distinguished hunters, from Hercules downwards; and although Diana, the patron deity of the chase, bears them as her emblems of office.³ From numerous allusions interspersed in the text, it appears that Xenophon knew or recognised no game season.⁴ He hunted equally at all times of the year, unless when extremes of weather interfered.

Use and

The essay concludes with a eulogy of the chase,

¹ x.

² vi. 3.

³ The description however which Xenophon, in an illustrative passage of the *Cyropædia* (i. vi. 39.), gives of the netting of winged game by means of lure birds, much in the mode now common in Italy, shows him to have been familiar with that art. The same work also contains descriptions of hunting on horseback, as practised among the Persians.

⁴ v. *passim*, vi. 26.

as a school for the art of war, as a recreation contributing to health of body and equanimity of mind, and far more innocent and useful in all respects, than many of the forms of labour or indolence, in which those who affect to despise it are accustomed to spend their time. Severe reflexions are passed, in a digression of some length, on the Sophists; or in other words, on certain anti-Socratic literary men of the day, who had expressed themselves disparagingly of the author's favourite pursuit, and are contemptuously contrasted with the Philosophers, by whom it had been more favourably judged.¹

value of
the art of
hunting.

"Sophistical"
objections
combated.

¹ xi.—xiii.

CHAP. XVI.

THE REMAINING HISTORIANS OF THE ATTIC PERIOD.

1. LOSS OF THEIR WORKS. MORE EXACT DEFINITION OF THE ATTIC PERIOD. CTESIAS. HIS SERVICE AT THE PERSIAN COURT. HIS BIRTH AND AGE.—2. HIS WORKS. HIS PERSICA. HIS SYSTEM OF EARLY ORIENTAL HISTORY, COMPARED WITH THE SYSTEMS OF BEROSUS AND HERODOTUS.—3. ITS UNCITICAL CHARACTER.—4. HIS PERSIAN HISTORY PROPER.—5. HIS INDICA. HIS MENDACITY. HIS MINOR WORKS. HIS STYLE. DINON: HIS PERSICA.—6. PHILISTUS. HIS AGE. HIS CONNEXION WITH DIONYSIUS I. OF SYRACUSE. HIS BANISHMENT. HIS RESTORATION UNDER DIONYSIUS II. HIS DEATH AND CHARACTER. HIS WORKS. HIS IMITATION OF THUCYDIDES.—7. THEOPOMPUS. HIS LIFE AND TIMES. ORATOR AND HISTORIAN.—HIS AGE.—8. HIS CHARACTER. HIS WORKS. HIS EPIHOME OF HERODOTUS. HIS HELLENICA. HIS PHILIPPICA.—9. ANALYSIS OF ITS CONTENTS. HIS HONESTY. HIS CENSORIOUSNESS.—10. HIS LOVE OF THE MARVELLOUS. HIS STYLE. HIS RHETORICAL WORKS.—11. EPHORUS. HIS AGE. HIS EDUCATION. HIS HISTORICAL WORK.—12. ANALYSIS OF ITS CONTENTS.—13. HIS CREDIT AS A HISTORIAN AND GEOGRAPHER. HIS SECONDARY WORKS. HIS STYLE.—14. CRATIPPUS. SOPHÆNETUS OF STYMPHALUS. HERMIAS OF METHYMNA: HIS SICULA, ETC. TIMONIDES OF LEUCADIA: HIS EPISTOLARY HISTORY. ATHANAS OF SYRACUSE: HIS SYRACUSAN HISTORY. DIONYSIODORUS AND ANAXIS. CHERPISODORUS. ZOÏLUS OF AMPHIPOLIS. DEMOPHILUS.—15. PHANIAS OF ERESUS: HIS ERESIAN PRYTANES; OTHER WORKS. CLIDEMUS: HIS ATTHIS. OTHER ATTHIDISTS. PHANODEMUS.—16. CALLISTHENES. HIS BIRTH. CONNEXION WITH ALEXANDER. HIS CHARACTER.—17. HIS DEATH. HIS WORKS.—18. HIS HELLENICA. HIS HISTORY OF ALEXANDER. HIS PERIPLUS. HIS SCIENTIFIC WORKS. HIS TREATMENT OF MYTHOLOGY. HIS STYLE.

Loss of
their
works

1. The remaining historians of the Attic period are numerous; but no integral work by any one of them has survived. There may thus be observed, in regard to this branch of composition, a near correspondence between the commencement and the close of the period. It began with fragments, and it ends with fragments. The analogy may be extended from History to Poetry and Philosophy. In each department destiny has been favourable in preserving, amid

the general wreck, what was most worthy of being preserved. Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Plato, still exist in their integrity; and we possess Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, and Aristotle, each in sufficient fulness to admit of our appreciating their excellence. It may indeed seem but the natural course of events, that the best and most popular works should be best able to struggle through the obstacles interposed by time or barbarism to their passage to posterity; although the history of literature, in Greece as in other countries, offers some notable exceptions to this rule.

The epoch which has here been adopted as the close of the Attic period, is the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C. In the adjustment of literary dates by this epoch, reference will be made, less to the birth or death of each author, than to the circulation of his works. Where the whole, or the more important part of them, were published prior to 323 B.C., he will be considered as belonging to the Attic, in the opposite case to the Alexandrian period. It may not be easy in every instance to draw the precise line of distinction; but there will be no serious difficulty in regard to historians of higher celebrity; and where doubt exists in regard to others, it will matter but little under which period their works may be classed.

Closer definition of the Attic period.

As a general rule the authors who, under the title of Historians of Alexander, occupy towards the close of the fourth century B.C. a large space in the field of Greek historical composition, will be considered as belonging to the Alexandrian age. Even where their lives may have fallen in great part within the present period, the works to which they chiefly owe their

reputation, must with rare exception have been published after the death of the principal hero whose actions they record: or, in the few cases where they may have been circulated during his lifetime, it will be desirable to class them with the rest, as appertaining to a single age, as well as a single branch of literary composition.

The writers of whom, consistently with these limitations, it remains to treat, are about twenty in number. But of these, many are in themselves of so little value, or the knowledge we possess of their lives and compositions is so slight, as to entitle them to a small share of notice in this work. While the list contains no author who can presume to cope either in excellence or celebrity with Herodotus or Thucydides, several may claim to rival, if not to surpass Xenophon, taking his qualifications as historian alone into account, in the esteem with which they were honoured by the antient public.

CTESIAS,¹

son of Ctesiochus, was a physician of Cnidos, a Lacedæmonian colony on the coast of the Asiatic Doris. He is described by Galen as a kinsman of Hippocrates, and as belonging like him to the family of the Asclepiadæ; which latter notice is to be understood, it may be presumed, in regard to each author, in a figurative rather than a literal sense. Seventeen years, the best probably of his professional life, were

His service at the

¹ J. C. Bähr, *Ctesias Cnid. Reliquiæ*, 1824; C. Müller, *Ctes. Cnid. Reliq. in Didot, Frgg. Hist. Gr.* The fragments are cited according to Müller.

passed at the court of Persia¹; where it had long been the custom to employ Greek physicians. He lived fourteen years in the service of Darius Ochus, three in that of his son Artaxerxes, and returned to Greece in 398 B. C.² His first entry on office must therefore have taken place in 415 B. C. Assuming him to have been then thirty years of age, his birth would fall in the year 445 B. C., or about ten years prior to that of Xenophon.³ He is said by some authorities to have been made captive in war by his royal patron, and retained in a professional capacity about his person.⁴ But this is not probable; there having been no war between Persia and the Greek states in 415 B. C. The mistake originates, there can be little doubt, in a misunderstanding, by superficial biographers, of the notices, by Ctesias himself in his Persica and by Xenophon in the Anabasis⁵, of Ctesias having been present at the battle of Cunaxa, and having dressed the wound which Artaxerxes received from Cyrus. Ctesias further describes himself as one of the envoys, sent by Artaxerxes to treat with the Greek commanders after the battle. This statement has been denounced by Plutarch⁶ as a falsehood, because Xenophon⁷, who was himself present at the conference, and mentions another Greek as a member of the mission, says nothing of Ctesias. It is not

Persian
court.

His birth
and age.

¹ Auctores ap. C. Müller ad Ctes. Rel. p. 1. sqq.

² Diodor. II. 32.; Photius, in Frg. 20. p. 58. Didot.

³ No apology will here be necessary, for having slightly disturbed the chronological order of our subject in treating of the two authors, by giving precedence to Xenophon, as the continuator of Thucydides, and as the only Greek historian of the century whose works have been preserved.

⁴ Diodor. loc. cit.; alii ap. Müller, loc. cit.

⁵ In Artox. 13.

⁶ I. viii. 27.

⁷ Anab. II. i. 7.

impossible that Ctesias, as an author of proverbially doubtful veracity, may here have been guilty of falsehood. But the ground on which the charge has been brought against him by Plutarch is hardly conclusive. Ctesias might be present without being recognised by Xenophon. If he wished, and he may have had reasons for wishing, to remain unknown, the Persian dress which he wore, or was entitled to wear as a court functionary, would easily prevent his being recognised.

Ctesias further describes himself as having exerted his utmost influence with Artaxerxes to alleviate the captivity of Clearchus; and as having refused to supply him in his prison with a weapon for the commission of self-destruction.¹ But his efforts were unavailing to procure the pardon or save the life of his unfortunate countryman. He was afterwards employed by Artaxerxes in diplomatic services²; first in an attempt to adjust certain disputes between Evagoras, king of Salamis, and the other petty Cyprian princes, vassals of the Persian monarch; and in the sequel as plenipotentiary in the negotiations between Artaxerxes and Conon, which resulted in their league against Lacedæmon. For this honourable office he was indebted, if we may trust a report mentioned by Plutarch³, to his fraudulent insertion into a confidential letter from Conon, which he had been commissioned to deliver to the king, of a passage recommending his own appointment. He was subsequently charged with a mission to Sparta⁴,

¹ Frg. 29. § 60. : conf. Plutarch, *Artax.* 18., who here again indirectly taxes him with "romancing."

² Phot. ap. Didot, *Frg.* 29. § 63.

³ *Artax.* 21.

⁴ Photius in *Frg.* 29. § 63.

of what precise nature we are not informed; and soon after permanently resettled in his native city. Of the latter part of his life, or the date and circumstances of his death, no record has been preserved.

2. The two principal works of Ctesias were his *Persica*, or Persian history; and his *Indica*, or Descriptive notices of India. Three other minor productions were attributed to him, a *Periplus*, a tract On Mountains, and another On Rivers.¹

The *Persica* treated, in twenty-three books, the history, not only of Persia in the proper sense, but of the portion of Central Asia over which the Persian empire extended, from the earliest time, down to the close of the author's residence at the court of Artaxerxes, in 398 B.C.² It was hence divided into three parts: I. The history of the first, or old Assyrian empire of Asia; II. The history of the Median empire, by which in the theory of Ctesias that of Assyria was supplanted; III. The history of the Persian empire proper, which supplanted that of the Medes. The first and second parts comprised three books each; the third part the remaining seventeen.

The pretensions advanced by Ctesias, and in some degree conceded by the Greek public, to a superiority over previous historians in the treatment of Asiatic subjects, were based on the greater facility of access which his long residence at the Persian court, and the position he there occupied, had afforded him to authentic native sources; especially to the original

¹ Müller ap. Didot, ad. Frg. p. 3. 107. The title *Περὶ πόρων* has been, perhaps with reason, understood by Müller as belonging to a book or subdivision of the *Persica*.

² Suid. v. Ctes.; Photius ap. Didot, Frag. 29. § 1.; Clinton, Fast. Hell. in an.

archives in which the vicissitudes of those several dynasties were recorded.¹ These pretensions may have been well founded in regard to Persian history in the proper sense, especially that portion of it immediately connected with his own time. Nor is it improbable, even in the then backward state of philological science, that a Greek man of letters, officially employed during many years at Susa, may have acquired sufficient knowledge of the language to enable him to consult the Persian written records. He cannot however be supposed to have possessed an equal familiarity with the other Asiatic tongues, radically distinct from the Persian, in which the chronicles of the previous Median and Assyrian dynasties were written. Nor indeed does Ctesias appear to have distinctly asserted a claim to such high philological qualifications; his appeals to original sources being limited to the "Persian" registers. There can however be little doubt of his having meant, by this vague generality of terms, to convey to his countrymen, slightly conversant as they were in such matters, the impression that the whole original records of Asiatic history were stored up in those Persian repositories. It is also possible that the Persian state chronicles may have contained, in the time of Ctesias, a Persian digest of those of the other older conquered dynasties.

compared
with the
systems of
Berosus
and Hero-
dotus.

His pretensions to have embodied, in the first two divisions of the *Persica*, the genuine substance of the native oriental records, from whatever source derived, will be most effectually tested by a comparative estimate of the conflicting claims to a similar merit,

¹ Diod. II. 32. : conf. Fragg. Ctes. 18. 29. § 1.

on the part of the two other more accredited organs of older Asiatic tradition, Herodotus, and Berosus the native Babylonian compiler of the Alexandrian age.

The result of this estimate is conclusive in favour of Berosus. As a native Assyrian he possessed qualifications for original research, to which Herodotus did not pretend, and Ctesias had no just pretensions. He was considered, and with apparent reason, by the Greeks an honest writer, whose object was neither to invent nor adorn, but to digest for their benefit, in their native tongue, the traditions contained in the antient historical books of his country. Those traditions, as they appear in his remains, also bear internal evidence of genuine character, both in their oriental forms, and in their correspondence with the Jewish history, in many points regarding which we know that there existed a community of tradition, reflecting a community of origin, between the Mesopotamian and Hebrew races. This correspondence becomes, in the later historical period, so close, both in regard to names and events, as to evince the good faith of the Chaldee chronicler, and hence to justify our confidence in his correctness in other cases. Of such internal evidence either of completeness or correctness, but little can be discovered in Herodotus, and still less in Ctesias. We subjoin a brief summary of each of the rival systems.

In the Assyrian tradition of Berosus¹, the very extravagance of the fables concerning Chaos, the Creation, and first foundation of the Assyrian empire, combined with their orientally mystical tenor, seems to guarantee their genuine origin. The analogy

¹ In Didot, *Frgg. Hist. Gr.* vol. II. p. 495. sqq.

which, without any trace of piracy, they here and there present to the Mosaic tradition, becomes complete with the Deluge. The description of that catastrophe is, in its substance, an exaggerated version of the Scriptural account. We have, under Chaldean forms and names, a Chaldee Noah; a Chaldee Shem, Ham, and Japhet; the tower of Babel, the future site of Babylon; the confusion of tongues, and the dispersion of the human race. The whole antediluvian period, as measured by the antient mystical arithmetic, lasted 432,000 years. With the dispersion, the correspondence between the Assyrian and Biblical tradition is interrupted. The first postdiluvian dynasty comprised 86 Chaldee kings and 34,000 years. Then followed a Median conquest of Babylonia, and a dynasty of eight Median kings, of 224 years' duration; then 11 other kings of uncertain race or length of reign. Next follow 49 Chaldee kings, reigning 458 years; 9 Arab kings, 245 years; 45 Assyrian kings, 526 years. Hitherto names are rare in the extracts. The catalogue from Phul and Sennacherib who succeed, down to Nabonedus the last of the line, becomes clearly historical; both names and events correspond in all essential particulars with those recorded in Scripture. With Nabonedus, conquered by Cyrus, the Assyrian empire is brought to a close, and the Persian empire succeeds.

Ctesias commences his Asiatic history with the conquest of the greater part of Asia by the Assyrian founder Ninus, who constructs the metropolis called after himself Nineveh. His widow and successor Semiramis, builds Babylon, and by her own victories extends her empire over Egypt, Ethiopia, Libya,

and part of India.¹ She is followed by thirty-one sluggard kings, whose reigns are signalised by no remarkable event but the mission of "Memnon" to assist Priam against the Greeks. The last of the line is Sardanapalus, who is conquered by one of his own satraps, Arbaces the Mede. The whole duration of the Assyrian empire is 1306 years.² The Median empire succeeds, extending, like the one supplanted, over Central Asia. It comprises nine kings and 317 years. Astyages, the last of these kings, is subdued by Cyrus the founder of the Persian empire, which still flourished in the time of Ctesias.³

Herodotus has an Assyrian empire of 520 years, and a Median empire of four reigns and 150 years. The details of his system, as compared with that of Ctesias, have been considered in treating of his own work.⁴

3. We have already had occasion to notice, as evidence of the factitious nature of the popular Hellenic digests of oriental history, their tendency to concentrate the destinies of each empire and its rulers, on the person and acts of two or three notable kings; on a primeval founder, a Ninus or a Menes, and a great foreign conqueror, a Semiramis or a Sesostris; the remaining members of the dynasty, with rare exception, being drone or sluggard kings, of whom little more than the existence had been recorded. A comparison of Ctesias and Berosus seems to prove, that the same method of centralisation was resorted to in dealing with dynasties, as with separate kings. The antediluvian period of Berosus, which the critical modern reader will appreciate as a fundamental ele-

Its uncritical character.

¹ Frgg. 1—16.

² Frgg. 25—28.

³ Frgg. 17—21, 22.

⁴ Vol. IV. p. 333. sqq.

ment of the original system, is struck off by Ctesias altogether; as appertaining doubtless, in the estimation of so critical a compiler, to mythology rather than history. The alternation in Berosus, of native Assyrian, Median, Arabian, and Chaldee dynasties, reflects evidently a series of struggles among the rival Asiatic races, for the supremacy which, as enjoyed by each, still continued to rank as "The Assyrian empire;" just as in the parallel course of authentic Egyptian history, we have native Egyptian, Ethiopian, and Asiatic dynasties, competing for the imperial crown of Egypt. It is the more easy therefore to recognise in the two distinct Assyrian and Median empires of Ctesias, the one supplanting and extinguishing the other, two successive centralisations, for the benefit of the Greek public, of the Babylonian compiler's less compact and symmetrical series of oriental vicissitudes; just as all the achievements of the thirty-three Assyrian kings and legislators are concentrated on Ninus and Semiramis; all their sluggishness on the one pre-eminent sluggard Sardanapalus. Although Berosus, among other proofs of his impartiality, admits a Medo-Assyrian dynasty in his general course of national revolution, he evidently admitted no permanent Median supremacy in the sense of Ctesias, prior to that jointly established by the Medes and Persians under Cyrus. That none such existed is also clear from the contemporaneous Bible records. These, collated with Berosus, prove that during the whole 317 years of the alleged Median empire of Ctesias, a powerful Assyrian monarchy continued to flourish, under the to us familiar kings, Phul, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, Nabonassar, Nebuchadnezzar, Evil-merodach, &c. Of these names

or persons Ctesias knows or professes to know nothing. He expatiates at some length¹ on the achievements of his Median kings, against the Cadusians, Parthians, and Sacæ, but without a hint of their standing in any relation either of dependence or rivalry to a still existing Assyrian empire. If he and his authorities therefore are so greatly in the dark, regarding events on which the light of history clearly shines, small faith can be due to their statements regarding those where that light is dim or altogether extinguished. The system of Herodotus, while also representing the old Assyrian empire of Asia as overthrown by the Medes, and in other respects but a variety of that of Ctesias, yet recognises a remnant of independent Babylonian monarchy, as continuing to subsist. He also knew and mentions the exploits of the warlike monarch Sennacherib.²

The greater apparent probability of the Ctesian chronology is one of the strongest arguments of its

¹ Ap. Diodor. II. 33.; Didot, p. 42.

² Traces of partiality may also perhaps be discerned on the part of Berosus, in his suppression of all notice of a separate Median monarchy, existing by the side of that of Assyria, during the declining stages of the latter. That such a Median kingdom did exist, and if not permanently, for a time in a virtual state of independence, there can be little doubt. Berosus probably viewed its sovereigns, and perhaps with some reason in the light of revolted vassals rather than legitimate princes. (Frgg. 12—14. Didot.) As himself a Babylonian, or Chaldean, he also appears everywhere to speak of the Babylonian as equivalent to the Assyrian empire, and of Babylon as its sole metropolis; Nineveh being overlooked or left in the background. There can however be no doubt, both that Nineveh had been at times the more favoured metropolitan seat of the consolidated empire; and further that, at other periods, rival Assyrian empires had existed contemporaneously, one under a Babylonian, the other under a Ninevite dynasty. Here again the analogy of Egypt presents itself. The two cities seem in fact to have stood to each other, much in the same relation as Thebes and Memphis in the Egyptian empire.

non-genuine character. No historical critic of the present day, familiar with the late researches into the comparative antiquities of the oriental nations, can believe, that in any Assyrian chronicle, the whole duration of the great empire of Central Asia was ever restricted to 1300 years, or within ten times that period of time. The Cnidian compiler's own annals, especially his account of Semiramis, have no doubt their full share of mythical extravagance.¹ It is however an extravagance presenting the same proper Hellenic type of fable, with which we are familiar in the parallel adventures of Bacchus or Sesostris. Had the Ctesian tradition of Semiramidian conquest really formed a 'chapter of the genuine Babylonian registers, it is very unlikely that a native annalist would have suppressed one so glorious to his own nation. But Berossus, like Herodotus, knows nothing of a primeval Semiramis, the foundress of Babylon and conqueress of the trans-Asiatic world. He pointedly repudiates the fables related of her by the Greeks,

¹ Fragg. 11. 14.; Didot, p. 503. 507. There can be little doubt that the primary source of the fabulous exploits and renown of this personage in the Ctesian system, is to be sought in the identity of her name, Semiramis, with one of the numerous titles under which the great Oriental Water-Goddess, or Aphrodite, better known to Greek archaeologists by those of Astarte, Ashtaroth, Derceto, Atergatis, was worshipped among the Pagans of Semitic race. This identity seems to result from a collation of parts of the legend concerning her in Ctesias, with other parallel legends in Berossus. The former (frg. 5.) described her as a daughter of Derceto the Syrian Fish-Goddess, and as first married to Onnes a favourite officer of Ninus. Onnes, or Oannes, with Berossus, is himself a Fish-God (frg. 1. Didot, p. 496.). She is hence probably identical with the Fish-Goddess Homorka, who in the Berossian legend shares the functions of Oannes in the mystical cosmogony (Didot, p. 497.). Ctesias represents Semiramis (frg. 5. § 6.) as worshipped after her death in the form of a dove, having been nourished by doves when a child; and Aphrodite or Astarte, of whom the dove is an emblem, as having presided at her birth. He hence interprets her name to signify the Dove-Goddess.

and like Herodotus, reduces her to an ordinary sovereign of one of the later Assyrian dynasties.

The single exception to the torpor of the Ctesian line of sluggish kings, is in favour of Memnon, whose valiant deeds on the field of Troy, appear to have been described in the original records consulted by Ctesias, with a Homeric detail, proving that in so far as those records ever existed, Greek as well as Persian inventive genius had been employed in their preparation.¹

4. With the Persian era, the basis of fact in his narrative becomes more distinct, and widens as we advance. It is here that his pretensions to a better access to native sources than previous Greek authors had enjoyed, first acquire plausibility. Of this strictly Persian portion of the Persica, we possess an epitome by Photius², which seems to comprise the full substance of the original; partly as containing many minor details, the admission of which imply that no important fact had been omitted; partly because no such fact, not comprised in its text, is mentioned in any other quotation from the work. During the last seventeen years over which the narrative extends, it also possesses the advantage, that its author was personally cognisant of the events which he describes. Throughout that portion of the work, the subject of which was common to Herodotus, a ruling principle of its author's historical method, seems to have been antagonism to his distinguished predecessor³; so that any judgement on the contents of the Persica, down at least to the close of the Persian war, resolves itself very much into a comparative estimate of the

His
Persian
history
proper.

¹ Frg. 18.

² Frg. 29. p. 45. sqq., Didot.

³ Frg. 29. § 1.

correctness of the two historians. In the outline and general substance of their narratives, no essential difference is observable. The number of reigns in each is the same. In the lives or fortunes of the sovereigns there is also a general correspondence. The duration of the reigns in some cases differs, the numbers of Ctesias being, by reference to more authentic chronological data, commonly wrong. Attention has been directed in our previous chapters to some of the chief diversities of detail in the two authors.¹ Subjoined is a notice of the remainder, in so far as deserving attention.

Ctesias describes Cyrus as beaten and taken prisoner in a war with the Sacæ², of which event nothing is said by Herodotus. In his account of the siege of Sardis, the Cnidian historian substitutes some very foolish fables of his own, for equally foolish fables of Herodotus which he omits.³ He rejects the legend of Cræsus on the pile, and with reason; such a mode of executing criminals being assuredly at variance with Persian manners. The tradition concerning the death of Cyrus is also different in the two authors. With Ctesias⁴ he is slain in a war against the Derbices, a tribe dwelling on the Indian frontier; with Herodotus in a war against the Scythian queen Tomaris. Ctesias, in conformity with his own theory that the Medes had enjoyed, and the Persians as their conquerors had at once succeeded to, the full possession of the old Assyrian empire, omits the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, the most important of his conquests with Xenophon and Berossus, as well as Herodotus. He places the subse-

¹ Vol. IV. p. 339. 401.

² Frg. 29. § 3.

³ Frg. 29. § 4., Frg. 31.

⁴ Frg. 29. § 6.

quent revolt, siege, and reduction of that city under Xerxes, not under Darius, and rejects his predecessor's account of the patriotic self-mutilation of Zopyrus.¹ The story of the Magus², who personates the murdered brother of Cambyses (called Smerdis by Herodotus, Tanaoxares by Ctesias and Xenophon), is in substance the same in both authors, though differing in some particulars. Datis, the Persian commander at Marathon, who according to Herodotus escapes alive, is slain according to Ctesias.³ The latter author mentions neither the sea-fight of Artemisium, nor the battle of Mycale, which figure so gloriously in the Persian war of Herodotus. With Ctesias, the capture of Athens by Xerxes, and the battle of Salamis, are placed (very absurdly it would seem) not before, as with Herodotus, but after the defeat of Plataea.⁴ The assault and sack of the Delphic sanctuary by a Persian force, after the flight of Xerxes to Asia, seems to be a Persian fable.⁵ The other discrepancies between the two authors regarding that war, especially in the numbers of the combatants, have been examined in a former chapter.⁶

The sequel of the Persica, from the point where the parallel narrative of Herodotus ceases, is occupied chiefly with local Asiatic wars and politics, and with the intrigues, incests, murders, parricides, and other scandalous crimes of the Persian court. The battle of the Eurymedon is not mentioned. The war against the revolted Lybo-Egyptians under Inarus is described much as in Herodotus. No allusion occurs to the part taken by Persia in the Peloponnesian war.

¹ Frg. 29. § 21.² Frg. 29. § 10.³ Frg. 29. 18.⁴ Frg. 29. § 26.⁵ § 27.⁶ Vol. IV. p. 337. sqq., 399. sqq.

The revolt of Cyrus is narrated in some detail, with little material variation from the account of Xenophon, whose *Anabasis* Ctesias appears to have read. He describes himself as having obtained information regarding these points of Persian history from the queen-mother Parysatis.¹ He represents the royal army at Cunaxa as only 400,000², instead of the 900,000 at which it is rated by Xenophon. His kind offices to Clearchus, his subsequent diplomatic services to Artaxerxes, and resettlement in Greece, with which his narrative ends, have already been noticed.

It must be admitted, that while in the general narrative of the Persica, in so far as preserved, there is little or nothing to warrant the severe charges of mendacity brought against its author by Plutarch and others, in some points where he differs from Herodotus he appears to have the advantage. His estimate of the force of Xerxes is comparatively free from the exaggeration manifest in the numbers of Herodotus. His notices of Persian manners appear also in some points more accurate than those of his predecessor.³ It was but natural that he should write in some degree under the influences to which he had long been subjected. But there is no solid foundation for the charge, of his having perverted the truth in order to gratify his royal patrons or the Persian people.⁴ As his work was not published till after his resettlement at home, he was altogether beyond the reach of such inducements to dishonesty. But apart from this, his accounts of the defeat and capture of

¹ Frg. 29. § 32. *seqq.*

² Bähr. *Ctes. Reliq.* p. 40.

³ Frg. 41.

⁴ Lucian, *de Conscr. Histor.* 39.

Cyrus by the Sacæ; of the battle of Thermopylæ; of the rout of 120,000 Persians by 7300 Greeks at the battle of Plataæ; of the destruction of the army of Darius by the Scythians, and above all, of the monstrous and disgusting crimes which, in the latter part of his narrative¹, he attributes to those, still surviving, Persian magnates whom he is accused of flattering, seem to prove the absurdity as well as the injustice of those imputations.

5. It is against the contents of his other principal work, "the Indica," there can be little doubt, that the charges of falsehood lavished on him by the ancient critics², are chiefly directed. This work, of which Photius has also bequeathed us an epitome, was not a history, or in any proper sense of the term a historical work. Did it describe anything really existing in nature, it might deserve the title of a treatise on Indian geography and natural history. But its contents were from beginning to end a tissue of fables, among the most extravagant ever brought within the compass of a single compilation in the most credulous times, and which it is surprising a man of so much real intelligence as Ctesias, could have had the folly and the impudence to present, as realities, to the Greek public of the age of Aristotle, as he certainly seems to have done. Some, but very few of the fables, and those not the least extravagant, rest on a certain foundation of fact. Several are common to Ctesias with Herodotus, or other early collectors of such anecdotes; some have been supposed, perhaps with reason, to be impersonations of

His Indica.

His mendacity.

¹ Fragg. 29, 30. 45. alibi.

² Auctt. ap. Müller in Didot, p. 8.: conf. Fragg. 56.; Plutarch, Artox. 1. G. 13.

monsters, sculptured or depicted on the Indian monuments, or on those of the kindred races. Even where natural objects are described, they are falsified or exaggerated to some wildly incredible extreme; are either many times larger, smaller, or more remarkable in some other respect, than the specimens of the same objects observable in other countries. A few examples are here subjoined¹, from which a fair judgement may be formed of the remainder :

The average breadth of the river Indus was about fifteen miles, five in the narrowest, twenty-five in the broadest parts. The ordinary age of the race on its banks was from 120 to 200 years. The king, when he went to the wars, appeared at the head of 100,000 elephants, with 3000 other chosen animals of the same race as his personal escort. On the banks of the river grew a reed, upwards of twelve feet in circumference and as high as the loftiest shipmast. The Martichora, or Maneater, was a creature the size of a lion, with the face, eyes, and ears of a man, and a skin red as scarlet. The tail was like that of a scorpion, armed with numerous stings of mortal venom. Those at the extremity of the tail were projectiles, which he darted at his adversaries in front and in rear, like arrows from a crossbow, and which, as they were expended, grew afresh. He is called the Maneater, as chiefly feeding on men. These animals abound in India, and Ctesias had himself seen one of them, sent by the king of that country as a present to the king of Persia. The average height of the Indian Pygmies is a cubit and a half. Their hair and beards reach down to their feet, and serve them instead of clothes, spread over their bodies before and behind. Their domestic animals are of proportional size; their horses and oxen as large as rams, their sheep the size of a lamb. The Indian sun during the first half of the day cools the air; during the latter half alone it produces heat. The water drawn from a certain fountain becomes a solid substance like cheese; a small piece of which again dissolved in common water and swallowed, causes a man to confess all his past actions, and deprives him of his senses for the rest of the day. It is hence employed by the magistrates to extract confession from criminals.

¹ *Fig. 57. : conf. 58. 63, 64. 67. 70. sq. 83. sq.*

In the mountains dwell a race of men, about 120,000 in number, with dogs' heads and paws. They have no language in the proper sense, but make themselves intelligible to each other by modulations of barking, as other people do by words. They are by profession hunters and pastors, possessing large flocks of sheep, goats, and asses, which they barter with their men-headed neighbours, for manufactured goods. They are the most just, and the most long-lived of all men (or dogs), their ordinary age being from 170 to 200 years.

In the same mountains is another race, about 30,000 in number, among whom no woman has more than one child in her lifetime. Each child is born with a full set of teeth; with eight fingers on each hand, and eight toes on each foot; with a full head of grey hair which becomes black with age, as that of other men becomes white; and with ears so long and broad as to cover their back, shoulders, and arms, like a cape, extending down to the elbows.¹

"In writing these things," the epitomist concludes, "Ctesias asserts that he writes what is perfectly true, partly on his own ocular testimony², partly on that of other eye-witnesses; and that he could narrate things still more wonderful, but abstains, lest he should appear to those who had not seen them to be writing things incredible."

Of the other works of Ctesias, the *Periplus*, and the treatises *On mountains* and *On rivers*, a few unimportant fragments have alone been preserved.³ From the *Alpheüs* being mentioned in the only citation of the work on rivers, it is probable that his geographical research was not confined to Asia.

His minor works.

The most unexceptionable attribute of Ctesias, for which he is highly commended by the native critics, is

His style.

¹ The Refrigerating sun, the Umbrella-eared men, or Otolicianians, with two other varieties of monster not mentioned in the above passage, the Griffins, guardians of the gold-coast, and the Sciapodæ or shade-footed men (frg. 70. 89.), are, as we have seen in the previous volume (pp. 140. sq. 155. 383.), common to the fable of Herodotus, Scylax, and other early geographers. The single child of the Otolicianian women, may also be compared with the single cub of the lioness, described by Herodotus, vol. iv. p. 384.

² Conf. Frg. 57. § 4.

³ Frgg. 88—95.

his style. The subjoined summary of its merits is given by Photius¹: "The style of this author is remarkable for clearness, simplicity, and suavity. His dialect is Ionic² in part of its idiom, but not to the same extent as that of Herodotus. Nor does he indulge like that author in unseasonable digressions. The charm of his composition lies chiefly in his faculty of striking and pathetic and varied description. Its principal fault is negligence or laxness, occasionally carried to mannerism." This judgement is supported by that of Dionysius³, and of Demetrius; the latter of whom pronounces him well deserving the title of poet, and praises the never-failing perspicuity of his narrative; but adds: that "he was blamed for diffuseness and tautology; in some instances justly, while in others the fault lay rather in the incapacity of his critics to appreciate the spirit of his description."⁴ It is hence the more remarkable that scarcely a passage of his works, of more than a single line in length, has been preserved in his own words, so that we are without the means of judging for ourselves how far these favourable criticisms may be correct.

DINON,

Dinon,
father of
Clitarchus.

a historian of good credit, though less celebrity than Ctesias, devoted himself like that author exclusively to Asiatic history. He appears to have treated his subject much in the same manner as

¹ Cod. LXXII.

² Preferred by him, as by Herodotus, to his native Doric. See Vol. IV. p. 514. : conf. Bähr, Ctes. Reliq. pp. 5. 22.

³ De Comp. Verb. 10.

⁴ De Eloc. 221. 218. It must be admitted that the specimen quoted by this critic, 219. (frg. 27.), is not favourable; the sentiment expressed being commonplace, and conveyed in an affected jingle of words.

Ctesias, and with deference probably to his example. Of his birthplace or parentage, no accounts have been preserved. His age we learn from the notice that he was father of Clitarchus, one of Alexander's principal officers and himself an author of some note. Dinon is hence familiarly quoted, in the citations from his text, by the distinctive title of "father of Clitarchus."¹ He may therefore have been nearly coeval with Philip of Macedon, and a younger contemporary of Ctesias.

His only recorded work was entitled, like the principal one of his predecessor, Persica. It was also divided into three parts; the first treating of the old Assyrian, the second of the Median, the third of the Persian empire. The most recent date referred to in his remains, connects itself with the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus 361—339 B.C.² His authority appears to have been esteemed in no degree inferior to that of Ctesias. He had not the advantage of so prolonged a residence in the East; nor probably did he advance similar pretensions to personal access to the native Asiatic registers. But he seems to have visited Persia, and done his best to inform himself of its history and customs, from original sources. Cicero³ quotes him with respect, and Cornelius Nepos⁴ prefers him to any other author on Persian affairs. Plutarch also everywhere keeps him in view, when treating of those parts of Persian history with which he was contemporaneous, especially the expedition of Cyrus, as a rival, and on some points preferable authority to Ctesias.⁵ But there is no appearance of his having, as some commentators have supposed, written in

¹ Frg. 3. Didot, vol. II. p. 88. sqq.

² Frg. 10.

⁴ Frg. 27.

³ Frg. 30.

⁵ Frg. 22. sqq.

a systematic spirit of opposition to Ctesias, similar to that by which Ctesias was himself animated towards Herodotus. In his account of the birth and early history of the elder Cyrus, and the foundation of the Medo-Persian empire, he seems, judging from the not very definite allusions contained in the fragments, to coincide with Ctesias rather than Herodotus.¹ He differed from both authors, in preferring the popular Egyptian to the Persian account, of the connexion by marriage between the Persian and Egyptian royal families, which preceded the downfall of the Egyptian empire. In the former tradition Neitetis, daughter of Apries, was, not as Herodotus represents her, the wife or mistress, but the mother, by Cyrus, of Cambyses; a version of the story which, however objectionable in other respects, is consistent with that chronological probability, against which the one preferred by Herodotus so seriously militates.² Dinon differed from Thucydides, in representing Themistocles³ as having sought refuge, after his exile, at the court of Xerxes, not that of his successor Artaxerxes; a view common to other eminent coeval authorities, such as Ephorus, Clitarchus, and Heraclides. In his account of the battle of Cunaxa⁴, he preferred the larger number at which the army of Artaxerxes was rated by Xenophon, to the more moderate estimate of Ctesias. Judging from the tenor of a large portion of the fragments, he dwelt much on the details of Persian manners, and especially, as did also Ctesias, on the profligacy of the Persian court and nobles in his own day.

The critical judgement of Dinon, in dealing with the fabulous parts of his subject, seems not to have

¹ Frg. 11.² See Vol. IV. p. 420.³ Frg. 20.⁴ Frg. 25.

been much superior to that of the rival Persian historian.¹ His account of Semiramis varied little in substance from that given by Ctesias. The differences of detail in his version, tended still further to divest her character of the remnant of genuine Oriental attribute, which Ctesias had allowed it to retain, and transform her from the purely divine, into the purely human order of mythological personage.

Of the style or dialect of Dinon no specific notice has been transmitted, nor are the few literal extracts from his text such as to admit of our judging for ourselves.

PHILISTUS,²

6. Son of Archimenidas, of Syracuse, deservedly ranks high among the writers of this period: first, as the standard historian of the greatest Greek colonial republic; secondly, as having treated the affairs of that republic, in their connexion with the mother country during the great crisis of the Peloponnesian war, in the same impartial spirit in which they had previously been treated by Thucydides, the historian of the opposite interest.

The precise epoch of his birth is uncertain. Plutarch³ mentions him as having witnessed the siege of Syracuse in 314 B. C.; which ambiguity of expression may imply that he was yet of too tender age to take an active part in the defence. Eight years afterwards he appears as a strenuous supporter of Dionysius the elder in his schemes of usurpation⁴, and as having

His age.

His connexion with Dionysius I. of Syracuse.

¹ Frg. 1—3. ² C. Müller, *Frsg. Histt. Gr.* (Didot), vol. i. p. xlv.

³ In *Nicias*, 19.; *Pausan.* x. 23. That he could have been a disciple of Isocrates, as stated by Cicero, *Orat.* ii. 22., is not probable, for reasons assigned by Müller, p. xlv.

⁴ *Nic.* 19.

greatly contributed by his wealth and social position to establish the tyrannical government. When Dionysius, in the early part of his career, was fined for seditious language by the republican magistrates, Philistus on the spot paid the amount imposed; and declaring that he would willingly pay all other fines that might be exacted on such grounds, exhorted him to persevere in the conduct which had given offence.¹ He must therefore at this time have been already of full age, and uncontrolled master of his actions and of his large property. He continued ever after, through good and evil repute, a steady and zealous supporter of the Dionysian interest. Among the ties which bound him to that cause, mention is made of an amorous intercourse betwixt him and the mother of the elder tyrant, not without the sanction or connivance of the son.² But his services were ill requited by Dionysius; who, on apparently slight grounds of offence, banished him from Syracuse. The ostensible cause of his sentence is said by some to have been his espousal of a daughter of Leptines, brother of Dionysius, without the knowledge or consent of her royal uncle. Others explain the sentence as provoked by groundless suspicions of the Historian's fidelity, with which insidious calumniators had poisoned the mind of Dionysius, at a time when a state of morbid irritability, caused by the ill success of his literary efforts, had rendered him peculiarly susceptible of such malignant influences.³ Philistus took refuge with friends in Italy, where he long resided in retirement, engaged in the composition of his work. Diodorus describes him as afterwards pardoned and restored to favour. But Plutarch, with

His
banish-
ment.

¹ Diodor. XIII. 91.

² Plutarch, Dion, 11.

³ Diodor. xv. 7.

more probability, represents his efforts to appease his master's wrath either by submission or flattery, as unavailing, and his restoration as having first taken place under the tyrant's son and successor, the second Dionysius, who entertained a warm sense of his merits.¹ His return is further said to have been highly agreeable to the members of the "tyrannical" faction, who foresaw in the reestablishment of his influence, an antidote to that of two men then high in the favour of Dionysius, his own kinsman Dion and Plato the philosopher; whose efforts to infuse a liberal spirit into his system of government had already been partially successful. Accordingly, the first use Philistus made of his renovated power was to procure the exile of Dion. Plato soon after voluntarily returned to Greece, and Philistus obtained, without a rival, the highest place in his master's confidence, and the chief command of his naval forces.² On the invasion of Sicily by Dion in 357 B.C., Philistus, then absent with a squadron on the Italian coast, hastened to the relief of the capital; and after some gallant efforts to maintain the royal interest against the powerful party leagued for its overthrow, was defeated in a decisive action with the hostile fleet.³ According to some accounts he slew himself, to avoid falling alive into the hands of his opponents; others describe him as having been made prisoner, and cruelly tortured to death in his native city. "Stripping him of his arms," writes Timonides⁴ the histo-

His restoration
under Dionysius II.

His death.

¹ Dion, 11.; De Exil. 14.; conf. Timol. 15.; Paus. I. xiv.; Corn. Nep. in Dion.

² Plutarch, Dion, 11. sqq.

³ Diodor. xvi. 9—11.; Plut. Dion. 25. sqq.; Ephorus ap. Plut. Dion, 35.

⁴ Ap. Plut. in Dion, 35.

rian, one of the leaders of the opposite party, "and
 "ignominiously exposing his naked body, they cut off
 "his head, and then handed over his corpse to a mob
 "of boys, with orders to drag it through the streets
 "and throw it into the stone-quarries."

and cha-
 racter.

It appears from these details that Philistus was, from principle as well as personal connexion, a keen partisan of despotic government. Nor does he seem to have been himself ambitious of supreme power; though evidently, within his own selected sphere of action, a man of aspiring temper and undoubted talent; and although the same vicissitudes, and the same personal advantages, which enabled him effectually to promote the rise of others, might naturally hold out temptations to similar designs on his own part. He was content with the post of ruling favourite, and in that capacity was a loyal and obsequious servant of his sovereign. Such would seem to be the character given of him by Ephorus; which Plutarch condemns as partial; and himself describes him, on the authority of the same hostile Timonides, not only as the most self-interested and servile adherent of tyrants; but as "a man singularly skilled in the art of cloaking unrighteous deeds
 "and vicious habits, under specious pretexts and
 "plausible phrases."¹

His works.

His works² were exclusively devoted to the affairs of his native island. They formed properly but a single narrative, under the title "*Sicelica*," or Sicilian history, but divided into two principal parts. The first, in seven books, contained the general history of Sicily, down to the accession of the elder

¹ Plut. Dion, 36.

² C. Müller ap. Didot, Frg. p. XLVIII.

Dionysius. The second part, in six books, treated of the reigns of the two tyrants, father and son. This part seems also to have been considered as forming two separate works; one consisting of four books on the father, the other of two books on the son. The latter subdivision remained incomplete; the author's death preceding that of his patron.¹ He commenced the history of his native island from its mythical age. Its earliest known inhabitants were described as Sicanian settlers from Spain, whom other authorities asserted to have been the indigenous population. It was afterwards occupied, about eighty years before the siege of Troy, not by Siculians, as in the more popular accounts, but by Ligyan emigrants from Italy, under a son of Italus, called Sicelus, who gave his name to his new territory. Philistus seems to have bestowed but a small, merely introductory portion of his narrative, on these mythical transactions. Already in the first book we find him engaged with the Phœnician and Hellenic colonies.² He was esteemed a truthful and impartial writer, where his personal feelings did not too strongly interfere. His account of the siege of Syracuse is quoted as of rival authority to that of Thucydides.³ The two would seem indeed to have been so much alike in substance, as to have led one commentator to assert, that Philistus did little more than transfer the narrative of his predecessor to his own volume.⁴ We have here at

¹ Diodor. XIII. 103., xv. 89.: conf. Auctt. ap. C. Müller loc. cit.

² Frg. 8. Didot.

³ Plutarch, Nicias, l.

⁴ Theon, Progymn. p. 8., ed. Basil.; who more especially (p. 89.) mentions the night battle. He differed slightly from Thucydides, in describing Demosthenes, more careful of his honour than his safety, as excluding himself from the conditions of surrender procured for his men. Frg. 46.

least evidence of the spirit of fairness in which he wrote, in a case where national feeling might be expected to have its influence. He has been accused, on the other hand, and probably with justice, of adulation in what he writes concerning his patrons. If those parts of his work were published during his own life, he could hardly have treated their affairs in any other than a panegyrical spirit.¹

His imita-
tion of
Thucydi-
des.

The strongest testimony to the literary merits of Philistus, is the honour conferred on him of being classed, both in regard to matter and style, by the best antient critics, with Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, among the standard classical Greek historians.² All authorities describe him as a close imitator of Thucydides; as emulating his diligent research, copiousness of facts, and conciseness of diction; as less obscure, but inferior in power and elegance to his great Attic model. He is hence characterised by Cicero, as a miniature or dwarf Thucydides.³ Longinus⁴ however commends passages of his text, for their majestic tone of expression. He is also praised by Dionysius of Halicarnassus⁵ for concentrating his narrative, by a continuous bond of epic unity, on a single subject, the affairs of Sicily, and avoiding irrelevant digressions. But the arrangement of his materials in other respects, is censured by the same critic as wanting in clearness, the structure of his phrases as often monotonous, and the speeches with which, like Thucydides, he seasoned his narrative, as

¹ Plutarch, Timol. 15.; Pausan. i. xiii.

² Dionys. Hal. De Præc. Hist. 3.; Cicero, Brut. 17.: conf. Plutarch in Alex. 8.; Montfauc. Bibl. Coisl. p. 597.

³ De Orat. ii. 13.; Ep. ii. ad Quint. 13.; Quintil. Inst. or x. i. 74.

⁴ De Subl. 40.

⁵ De Præcip. Hist. 5.: conf. Theon, Progymn. p. 33.

deficient in ethic spirit and argumentative power. His remains comprise no literal extract from his text, of sufficient length to supply any criterion, either of his style, or his dialect, which however there can be little doubt was the pure Thucydidean Attic.

THEOPOMPUS.¹

7. The extant biographical notices of this author, His life
and times. are chiefly comprised in a passage of Photius.² He is there described as son of a Chian citizen named Damasistratus; as having fled from his native island in company with his father, when the latter was banished on account of "Laconism;" and as having, after his father's death, been restored to his home, in consequence of letters in his favour and that of other exiles, addressed by Alexander the Great to the Chian government. During the lifetime of his royal protector, he appears to have remained in undisturbed possession of his rights of citizenship. But immediately after the death of Alexander, he again became a wanderer; from what cause has not been recorded. There can however be little doubt, that his second exile was the result of his conduct in the factions which continued to agitate the state of Chios, and in the course of which full scope was given to the ardour of his temper and the censorious bitterness of his writings.³ He was unsuccessful in an attempt to obtain a settlement in Egypt under the first Ptolemy; who is said to have held him in so great abhorrence as a mischief-maker and a calumni-

¹ Wichers, *Theop. Chii Fragmenta*, 1829; C. Müller, *Theop. Fragmenta*, in Didot, vol. I. p. 278. The fragments are cited according to Müller.

² Cod. CLXXVI.

³ Suid. v. Ephor.

ator, that he even contemplated putting him to death; from which extremity Theopompus was only¹ preserved by the intervention of powerful friends. No mention occurs either of his subsequent lot, or the date of his death. All authorities agree in describing him as a pupil of Isocrates; whether at Chios or at Athens, is a question which has been argued at great length and with little profit by modern commentators.² In the choice of his literary career he was led, by the advice it is said of his master, to historical composition, as better adapted to his genius than professional oratory.³ The judgement of Isocrates in this matter seems open to question; for both the genius and the style of Theopompus, as afterwards developed, seem to have partaken more of the fervour and excitement of the orator, than of the calmness and sobriety of the historian.⁴ Isocrates may possibly have feared, lest the over-ardent temperament of his pupil, if allowed full scope in the field of rhetorical display, might effervesce into exaggeration or bombast, and may have hoped that the diligent research and sedentary application, which the Muse of history exacts from her votaries, would tend to restrain any undue flights of fancy.

Both historian and orator.

But although Theopompus never practised as a professional or forensic pleader⁵, his preference for history was far from precluding his zealous cultiva-

¹ Photius, loc. cit. Josephus (*Antiq. Jud.* xii. 14.) and Eusebius (*Præp. Ev.* p. 354.) describe him as having been smitten with thirty days' insanity, as a judgement for his over-ardent attempts to pry into the mysteries of the Jewish religion.

² C. Müller, *op. cit.* p. LXVI.

³ Cicer. *De Orat.* II. 13. 22.

⁴ Quintil. x. i. 73.: *conf.* Dionys. Hal. *De præcip. Hist.* 6.; *De Vett. Scr. Cens.* iii.

⁵ Cicer. *de Orat.* II. 13.

tion of other popular branches of rhetoric. He is described indeed ¹ as exclusively devoted to that art during the earlier stages of his literary career, and as having first in more mature life applied himself to history. He specially prided himself on his proficiency and success as an orator. He boasted of rivalling or even surpassing his master in the estimation of the public; that in their time, and first by their joint efforts, the higher style of eloquence had been carried to perfection, and that there was not a city in Greece where he had not left a lasting impression of his rhetorical powers.² That there was some foundation for this self-eulogy may be gathered from his statement, corroborated by less partial authorities, that he was winner of the prize in the competition of orators at the obsequies of Mausolus prince of Caria; having there been victorious over his master Isocrates, and other little less formidable rivals.³ He is also described by Dionysius ⁴ as the most distinguished of all the disciples of Isocrates. That he was a man of opulent estate appears from his self-complacent notice, that while Isocrates and other eminent rhetoricians followed the profession as a means of subsistence, he cultivated literature in all its branches solely for his own gratification and that of the public.⁵

The only two specific dates regarding this author's His age. birth or age, one by Photius, the other by Suidas, are in serious conflict with each other. According to Photius, he was forty-five years old when relieved

¹ Quintil. x. i. 74. : conf. Dionys. Hal. De Præc. Hist. 6.

² Phot. Cod. CLXXVI. : conf. Euseb. Præp. Ev. p. 464.

³ Auctt ap. C. Müller, p. LXVII.

⁴ De Præcip. Histor. 6.

⁵ Photius, loc. cit.

from the ban of exile by the favour of Alexander. That monarch succeeded to the throne of Macedon in 336 B.C. Assuming, as is probable, his interference on behalf of the Chian exiles to have formed part of the measures adopted, soon after his accession, or about 335 B.C., for settling affairs at home before setting out on his Asiatic expedition, the earliest epoch at which Theopompus could have been born (335+45) would have been 380 B.C. He would consequently have been about sixty when he sought a refuge in Egypt. According to Suidas¹ his birth took place more than twenty years earlier, simultaneously with that of Ephorus, during what is called the anarchy of Athens, the year's interval, that is (304—303 B.C.), between the capture of the city by Lysander and the resettlement of its affairs by Thrasylus. The latter of these two dates appears most in harmony with the better-ascertained facts of the Historian's life.

Theopompus, as quoted by the same Photius, describes himself as coeval with his master Isocrates, in terms which seem to imply, that the difference of their ages was not greater than is usual between master and scholar. Isocrates was born in 436 B.C.; so that if Theopompus (as according to Photius) was born in 380 B.C., Isocrates would then have been fifty-six; and if the scholar commenced his lessons in his fifteenth year, the master would then have been upwards of seventy. These dates are not very compatible with the definition "coeval,"² applied by the Historian himself to the relation between the two. Another difficulty lies in the tradition which mentions Theopompus as one of the younger contem-

¹ In Theopompus et Ephorus.

² *συναιμύσαι.*

poraries of Thucydides, in whose favour, conjointly with Xenophon and the daughter of Thucydides, a claim was preferred to the honour of having composed, and passed off as genuine, the eighth book of the Attic historian's work. Theopompus, if born in 380 B.C., could hardly, much prior to his thirtieth year, or 350 B.C., have obtained sufficient standing as a man of letters to have been qualified for such a performance. This tradition therefore (on the data supplied by Photius), would assume the eighth book not to have been edited until nearly half a century after the death of its author. The intrinsic value of the tradition has no real bearing on this question. But it is difficult to see how it could, under the circumstances here supposed, have obtained currency at all, notorious as it must have been, that the same eighth book was known to Xenophon and Cratippus, at least forty years before the time at which Theopompus would be reported, according to the date of Photius, to have first brought it to light.

The date of Suidas, if not altogether satisfactory, is less difficult to deal with. Theopompus, if born in 403 B.C., would have entered the school of Isocrates at fifteen, when his master was forty-eight, which gives a juster proportion between their ages. He would have been about eighty when he sought an asylum with Ptolemy. That he was then of advanced age, may be inferred from this being the last event of his life of which mention occurs.

It may not be easy to adjust the precise merits of these conflicting data, which have with modern commentators been the subject of voluminous speculations. Nor, fortunately, is the exact epoch of the birth of Theopompus a point of vital moment in his own his-

tory or character. We know that he was a pupil of Isocrates; that he was contemporaneous with both Philip and Alexander, and that he survived the latter; that he wrote a history of the father, and was on friendly terms with the son; which general data suffice to establish the relation between himself and the times of which he wrote.

His character.

8. Theopompus, by reference to the joint evidence of his own works and of his antient critics, may be pronounced a man of honest heart, but of restless spirit and ungovernable temper. As a historian he appears to have been animated by a sincere love of truth, though often led by his excitable nature into exaggeration or misrepresentation. A harsh judge of human conduct, and unmeasured in his diatribes against crime and folly, he was not insensible to the great qualities of the more distinguished personages of whom he wrote. Himself apparently free from the scandalous vices which he satirises, he was imbued with an inordinate sense of his own merits, and unscrupulous in giving effect to his self-admiration, both in speech and writing. His vituperative attacks were chiefly directed against the luxury, sensuality, and social profligacy of the times, and of his more remarkable contemporaries; whose excesses he denounced with a vehemence, and described with a minuteness of detail, to which, even as exemplified in his remains, it would be difficult to find a parallel in any existing work on Greek manners. This very excess of virtuous irritation, and fondness for its display, may perhaps suggest a doubt how far it is to be taken as a manifestation of unmixed horror for the conduct stigmatised. In dealing with one who dealt so severely with others, it may not be

uncharitable to surmise, that his zeal may be made up, in part at least, of a certain spirit of negative morality, or even of morbid sympathy with the conduct described; the same which in unconstrained social intercourse, often leads men to converse freely, and in a spirit of levity, on scenes at which they would feel ashamed of being present, and practices in which they are themselves incapable of participating.

The historical works of Theopompus were, His works. an Epitome of Herodotus; a Hellenica, or Hellenic history; and a History of the life and reign of Philip of Macedon, entitled Philippica. His other compositions seem to have been chiefly orations or rhetorical discourses, and are described as numerous. Several of these have however, with apparent reason, been supposed parts or episodes of his great historical work. He is also said to have left memoranda, as materials for uncommenced or unfinished compositions.

The Epitome of Herodotus, in two books¹, may His Epitome of Herodotus. have been a first juvenile essay, preparatory to his attempts in original composition: but as no mention is made of it by any writer prior to the Byzantine age, its gennuine character is at least doubtful.

The Hellenic history, in twelve books², commenced, His Hellenica. like that under the same title by Xenophon, where Thucydides broke off, in 411 B.C.; and concluded with the battle of Cnidus in 394 B.C. Its remains are neither numerous nor of much interest. Their general tenor however implies it to have been a

¹ Suid. in Theop.

² Diodor. XIII. 42., XIV. 84.; Marcell. et Anon. in Vit. Thuc. Suidas mentions but eleven books of the Hellenica.

sensible practical work, and free from the eccentricities which abound in the *Philippica*. The abruptness of its conclusion seems to prove, apart from other evidence, that it was but a fragment of an undertaking originally designed on a more comprehensive scale. The battle of Cnidus could hardly have been deliberately adopted by any intelligent writer as the conclusion of a historical subject; belonging in truth to the commencement of the first really striking or interesting series of events, by which the lifetime of Theopompus was signalised, the struggle between Thebes and Sparta for the mastery of Greece. We are assured accordingly by Polybius, that Theopompus had originally contemplated a work of greater extent under the title *Hellenica*. The cause of his change of plan, if we may trust the same authority, was the impression made on his excitable mind, by the new and striking phasis which the character and achievements of Philip had introduced on the theatre of Greek political action, and the desire to constitute the life of that monarch the centre of a great historical compilation, on a plan which only Theopompus was capable of conceiving or carrying into effect. Polybius appears however to have harshly and unfairly judged his conduct in this particular. "Even "a partisan of monarchical government," he remarks¹, "would hardly hesitate, if he had the choice, to impart to his composition, by preference, a Hellenic title and character. But for a man who had commenced writing, and already brought his work to so advanced a stage under that title and character, "to exchange them for the insignia of royalty, indicates an entire perversion of judgement. For what

His *Philippica*.

¹ VIII. xiii.

“was the inducement of Theopompus to this breach
“of propriety? What but the consideration, that
“while all he could hope from the one method was
“honour, by the other he promoted his worldly
“interests.”

It will be shown in the sequel, that this latter charge is in no degree justified, either by the contents of the Philippica or the character of its author.

The plan of his new undertaking is certainly one of the boldest, or even the most extravagant in the annals of historical literature. It was, there can be little doubt, an imitation, or rather an exaggeration, of that of Herodotus. Upon the basis of time and principal action supplied by the twenty-three years of Philip's reign, 359—336 B.C., he accumulated, as Herodotus had done on the Græco-Persian wars, to such an extent as suited his object, the past history of every country with which the vicissitudes of his hero brought him ever so remotely into connexion, and of many where no such connexion can be discerned. To these excrescences of a more strictly historical character, was superadded a vast quantity of other matter, such as none but the most eccentric genius could have admitted into a work ostensibly devoted to the affairs of Greece during the Macedonian period: mythical tales; biographical memoirs; disquisitions on geographical and statistical antiquity; descriptions of religious rites and superstitions, of natural curiosities and preternatural phenomena. The loss of the integral text disables us from judging of the precise method in which these extraneous materials were arranged. But we know that many of them were not treated in the mode of mere incidental embellishment, but in long digressions, completely

superseding the main narrative. It hence occasionally happened, as one of the antient commentators remarks, that in three or four successive books of the *Philippica*, the name, neither of Philip nor of any other Macedonian, was so much as mentioned.¹ Of the bulk of the heterogeneous mass we may judge, from its having been distributed into fifty-eight books², a number unparalleled in any recorded historical work comprising a like brief period of time. The proportion which the main subject bore to the digressive episodes, was, as we learn from Photius, considerably less than one third of the whole; "so that the successor and namesake of Philip, who made war against the Romans, collecting into one continuous narrative that portion of the work which treated of the affairs of Macedon, by discarding the numerous digressions, but leaving the text in other respects unaltered, reduced the fifty-eight books to sixteen." Five of the whole fifty-eight³ had perished before the time of Photius.

Analysis
of its con-
tents.

9. The commentators have not left us without some clear insight into the nature of the superabundant matter. Very little space seems to have been allotted to the previous history of the Macedonian royal family; which would have formed a legitimate subject of introductory enlargement. Already in the first book we find the author engaged with the life and acts of Philip.⁴ The eighth book, of which the ostensible subject seems to have been the commencement of the Phocian war, was so entirely taken up

¹ Theon, *Progymn.* p. 34., ed. Basil.

² *Djodor.* xvi. 3.; *Phot. Cod.* clxxvi. p. 390. *Suidas* makes them seventy-two, a blunder explained by C. Müller, p. lxix.

³ viz. 3, 7, 9, 20. and 30.; *Phot. ibid.*

⁴ *Frg.* 33.

with anecdotes of prodigies and miracles, or with biographical notices of distinguished seers and miracle-workers, Epimenides, Pherecydes Syrius, Pythagoras, and others, as to be familiarly quoted under the title of the Book of wonders.¹ Some relief was given to its purely preternatural element, by commentaries on the Pythagorean philosophy, and the doctrines and mysteries of the Magi.² The tenth book passed in review the vicissitudes of Athenian policy, with the characters and acts of the leading statesmen, by whom the fortunes of the Attic republic had been guided. It hence obtained the separate title of the Book of demagogues.³ The books from twelve to eighteen⁴ seem to have been in greater part a continuation of the interrupted subject of the author's Hellenica, with digressions on the Cyprian and Trojan wars of Agamemnon, the Return of the heroes, and numerous other subjects Greek and Oriental. The ensuing books were devoted chiefly to Thrace and Northern Italy. The twenty-fifth contained speculations on Hellenic character and manners; on the vainglory of the Athenians; the invention of the alphabet; the worship of Venus at Corinth; the Festival of the Spartan Carneia. One or more of the following books treated of the Delphic monuments, ostensibly of those robbed or destroyed during the Phocian war. This part of the text hence bore the distinctive title of "The plundered treasures of Delphi."⁵ The books from thirty-nine to forty-one, inclusive, were devoted to Sicilian affairs⁶, during a period of fifty years, comprising the reign of the two Dionysii. The forty-third book treated of Italy and

¹ Fragg. 66. 70. 79.² Fragg. 71.³ Fragg. 89. sqq. 102.⁴ Fragg. 111. sqq.⁵ Fragg. 182.⁶ Diodor. xvi. 71.; Fragg. 204. sqq.

the neighbouring regions on the Adriatic; of the Tyrrhenians, Ligurians, Messapians, Thesprotians, Molossians, Celts, &c. Those from fifty-five to fifty-eight, judging from the extant fragments, were occupied chiefly with the geography and local history of Peloponnesus.

It is certain that this work, in spite of its strange incongruity of materials, possessed great intrinsic value, and bore abundant evidence of the research and ability of its author. Its popularity, both as an authority for facts and as an amusing and instructive miscellany, is proved by the extant citations of its text, which are more than twice as numerous as those of any other lost work of the age, although it produced others of equal or greater bulk. The estimation in which it was held is further testified by Dionysius, who among the antient critics appears to have most impartially appreciated the character and genius of Theopompus. "We may judge," he remarks, "of the extent of his labour by the greatly diversified contents of his work. For he not only describes the foundation of states and cities, the lives of kings, and the varieties of manners and customs, but every rare or wonderful object, which the sea or the land produces, has obtained a place in his undertaking. . . . Nor must it be supposed that the purpose of this mass of materials is merely to amuse; it is also replete with useful instruction to all classes of readers."¹ The same critic dwells on his power of investigating the remoter causes of events, and less obvious motives of conduct, with the more secret and subtle ingredients of good and

¹ De Præcip. Hist. 6. See the whole section.

evil in human character, in which those motives originate. There is no writer of the age, to whose statements of fact, amid many well-merited censures on his method, higher credit is attached by subsequent authorities. If he has at times swerved from truth, it was from no deliberate intent to deceive, or self-interested partiality towards some powerful patron. His favourable judgements, rare at the best, were dictated by admiration of good or great qualities, his strictures by a sincere disapproval of the conduct which he condemned. While therefore he has been emphatically characterised even by less friendly¹ critics as a "truthful man," it is solely against the unbridled license of his satire, that the charges of calumny² have been directed by any reasonable censor, never against his assertions of fact. Among the nearly four hundred extant citations of his text, there is but one in which he is accused of a positive misstatement; and here the frivolity of the imputation supplies in itself evidence of his habitual truthfulness. All that the proverbially jealous and malignant rival historian Timæus, has been able to urge against him is, that he described the younger Dionysius, as having performed his voyage from Syracuse to Corinth, not in a war galley but in a ship of burthen!³ Of the injustice he has met with from rival censors of human conduct, we can have no better evidence than a passage, already in part quoted, of the usually judicious and impartial Polybius; who, here following in the wake of his popular detractors, charges Theopompus with undertaking the history of

His
honesty.

¹ Athen. III. p. 15., conf. VI. p. 254. ; Suid. in Ephorus.

² Auctt. ap. Müller, De Theop. Didot, pp. LXXV—VI.

³ Frg. 216.

His cen-
sorious-
ness.

Philip from motives of self-interested flattery. No one who peruses the still extant portions of the work in which Philip's character is discussed, can acquiesce in this charge. Against no individual of any rank or character has Theopompus inveighed in more bitterly sarcastic terms. These attacks are limited, it is true, chiefly to Philip's moral failings; but are of such a nature, that if they ever came under the notice of that sovereign, they would have been more likely to procure its author the treatment he met with at the court of Ptolemy, than preferment at the court of Macedon. At the same time, and with as palpable sincerity, he gives Philip full credit for his great qualities as a politician and military commander. That he as little succeeded in obtaining his favour, as he ever probably thought of courting it, may be inferred from his banishment having extended over the whole or the greater part of Philip's reign, without any effort by his supposed patron to procure his restoration, or any asylum or relief afforded him during his difficulties. Polybius, strange to say, in another place¹ accuses him of both inconsistency and malignity, in first professing to undertake the life of Philip from an admiration of his great qualities, and afterwards bitterly satirising him for his vices. To the really impartial mind, such inconsistency must appear conclusive proof of sincerity. Similar is his treatment of Demosthenes, assuredly under no other influence than his satirical caprice. In one place² he sneers at the great orator as a man of variable character, incapable of steady attachment to the same friends or line of policy. Elsewhere he dwells on his courage and independent spirit, and on the ad-

¹ VIII. xi.

² Frg. 106.

miration which he excited throughout Greece by his patriotic support of the national cause.¹ There can be little doubt, from the internal evidence of his works, and from the subsidiary accounts of his political career, that Theopompus, although it is nowhere so stated by his biographers, was strongly opposed to Democratic government, and no friend to Athens. But however keen in his denunciations of Attic license, moral and political², and fond of enlarging on the opposite qualities of the Spartan state and people, he did justice to the virtues of Athenian great men³, and did not spare even his Lacedæmonian fellow-aristocrats, where their conduct appeared to deserve the lash.⁴

His boast of the time and money he had expended in geographical and statistical research, is justified by his topographical accuracy, and by his incidental notices of voyages or travels into distant or little frequented regions.⁵ He is the first Greek historian who shows⁶ any knowledge of Rome or her affairs, beyond the name of the city and the fables regarding her foundation; having described or alluded to her conquest by the Gauls. He also adverts⁷ to those coincidences between the manners of the Etruscans (called by him Umbrians) and the Lydians, which, as further investigated by modern archæologists, have gone far to prove the correctness of the much decried tradition of Herodotus, concerning the colonisation of Etruria from Asia Minor. It would seem however, from the extravagant accounts which he gives⁸

¹ Frg. 239.² Frgg. 117. 167. 263. 297.³ Frgg. 94. 111.⁴ Frgg. 89. 111. 218. 268.⁵ Frgg. 156. 264. : conf. Dionys. de Præc. Hist. 6.⁶ Frg. 144.⁷ Frg. 142.⁸ Frg. 222. : conf. 143.

of the manners of the Tyrrhenians, that he possessed little, if any personal knowledge of the interior of Upper Italy, and derived his information from popular hearsay. He seems also to have approved himself a critical antiquary, in his illustrative notices for example of the Delphic treasures and works of art, and of the origin and extension of the Ionian alphabet.¹

His love of
the mar-
vellous.

10. Next to his unbridled censoriousness, the principal defect laid to his charge, is his love of the marvellous², and the attention bestowed, chiefly it must be supposed in the episodical part of his work, on popular fables, of all the kinds most congenial to Greek fancy. Here however, with the other evidence which we possess of his freedom and boldness of thought, one is tempted to vindicate his good sense at the expense of his honesty, and to conjecture that he may, in this instance, have been guilty of pandering to the popular Greek taste for the marvellous, by palming on his readers what he did not believe himself. His whole compilation was evidently digested with a view to extensive popularity; to afford the most attractive viands to all classes of literary epicures. Consistently with this plan, he could hardly have excluded from his budget of entertainment, an ingredient which he knew to have formed, in the work of Herodotus and others of like character, a principal source of popularity. This conjecture seems to derive support from a passage in which he announces, in his usual vainglorious strain, his intention of proving to

¹ Fragg. 182. sqq. 219. 168, 169. From frg. 168., he appears to have detected an Athenian forged inscription, by its having been written with Ionian letters before their introduction into the public diplomacy of Athens.

² Auctt. ap. C. Müller, op. cit. p. LXXVI.; Fragg. 66. sqq. 85.

the world in this work, that he can relate fables with as good effect as Herodotus, Ctesias, or Hellanicus¹; a declaration indirectly implying, that he related them not so much because he believed them, as because he considered it a point of honour to maintain his credit against all rivals, in this as in other respects. His stock of marvellous materials comprised several legends remarkable for elegance of invention, and which we know to have been identified with the sympathies even of the more enlightened portion of his native public; those for example concerning the fifty years' sleep, and other miraculous acts and adventures, of the Cretan sage Epimenides.² In some cases he gave to the popular mythology an allegorical turn, in imitation of the Platonic method; as in the history of Silenus, modelled, half on the Atlantis of Plato, half on the legend of Proteus in the Odyssey.³ On other occasions he was not ashamed to countenance the most trivial nursery mythology of his time; as in his accounts, of the pigs born without ears; of the springs that flowed with wine; and of the men who lost their shadows for life in the Lycean sanctuary.⁴

Among the antient critics who have passed judgement on the style of Theopompus, the most favourable is Dionysius⁵; who compares it to that of his master Isocrates, as combining perspicuity, fluency, and dignity, with an occasional tendency to inflation. In passages of a more exciting nature, especially his vituperative diatribes, he describes him as rivalling

His style.

¹ Strab. i. p. 43., vii. p. 299.

² Fragg. 69, 70.

³ Fragg. 74. sqq.

⁴ Fragg. 211. 220. 272.

⁵ De Præcip. Hist. 6.: conf. Quintil. ix. 4. 35.; Plutarch, in Fragg. 204.

the emphatic power and impetuosity of Demosthenes. The principal defect imputed, is an undue straining after euphony, in the rounding off and symmetrical adjustment of his periods, and in his combinations of vowel sounds. Plutarch¹ commends his powers of pathetic description; and by Dion Chrysostomus his language is ranked, in narrative spirit, next to that of Thucydides. Longinus, and some other less lenient critics, charge him with endeavouring to produce grandeur of descriptive effect by an accumulation of words and petty details; and with subsiding from highflown exordia into vapid conclusions, instead of rising from equability to emphasis.² It is fortunate that we still possess the means of judging for ourselves on this point of his literary character. For not only are the "Fragments" of Theopompus far more numerous than those of any other "lost" Greek historian, but a far greater portion of them, than in any other case, consists of literal extracts, in the author's own words, often of great length and continuity of subject. The whole mass of such extracts, if embodied in a separate form, would fill from eight to ten octavo pages of ordinary print; a space several times greater than would suffice to contain all the other fragments of literal citation from historical works of this period. We have here conclusive evidence of the estimation in which the manner, as well as the matter of his composition was held. While compilers commonly thought it

¹ In Frg. 204.

² In Frg. 125. The passage here censured, though somewhat highflown, is certainly remarkable for descriptive power, and for richness and harmony of language: conf. Auctt. ap. C. Müll. de Theop. p. LXXV. sqq.

enough to quote Ephorus, Ctesias, or Timæus, in some convenient form of abridgement, they seem to have felt that the statements of Theopompus would have been spoilt, if conveyed in any other language than his own. Among these passages there may be some which justify the strictures of Longinus ; but the general character of the collection amply bears out the more favourable verdict of Dionysius. It would not be easy to imagine a series of miscellaneous extracts from any author, more generally marked by perspicuity, elegance, and spirit. His periods are at times prolonged to an extent which would, in most other writers, prove fatiguing. But such is their invariable fluency and distinctness of structure, that even in the longest the reader is rarely if ever sensible of an effort, either to comprehend the sense or follow the thread of the argument. One pervading defect of his style, also noticed by his antient censors¹, consists in its being, in its merits as in its defects, that of an orator rather than a historian. But it is a rhetorical style of a high order², and truly characterised by Dionysius as combining at times in just proportions, the excellences of the most accomplished Attic orators. It is remarkable that, proud as he was of his rhetorical talents, no traces appear, either in his fragments, or in the allusions of the antient commentators, to the introduction of set speeches into his text. Several of his moral reflexions are in a fine tone of sentiment. In one, he pronounced the "most miserable of all men to be the man who is miser-

¹ Cic. Brut. 17. .

² Conf. Phot. Cod. CLXXVI., who describes him as inferior to no orator of the school of Isocrates.

"able in the midst of worldly blessings." Another so nearly corresponds to a maxim of Thucydides, as almost to suggest suspicion of piracy.¹ His remains show a general familiarity with his native literature. Among his fellow-historians he mentions by name Hellanicus, Herodotus, and Ctesias. He speaks with contempt of Euripides, and with little respect of Plato²; accusing him of pirating some of his best dialogues from other essayists. The only disciple of Socrates for whom he is said to have entertained any respect, is Antisthenes the Cynic, from congeniality of temper it may be presumed.³

His
rhetorical
works.

Of the properly rhetorical works⁴ of Theopompus, the more remarkable seem to have been his Funeral Oration on Mausolus; an Encomium on Philip, and a Diatribe against Alexander; another against Plato; and a Treatise on Piety. Several Letters, or Discourses on questions of public or political interest, were also addressed by him to the Macedonian conqueror, under the title of Advice to Alexander, Epistle to Alexander. In one or more of these he severely attacked the conduct of certain of the con-

¹ Frgg. 77. 284. 302. He is accused by Apollonius, ap. Euseb. Præp. Ev. p. 464, 465., of plagiarism from Isocrates, Xenophon, and other writers.

² Frgg. 279. 281.

³ Frg. 280.

⁴ Auctt. ap. Müller, p. LXXIII. In the single allusion by an anonymous compiler (frg. 282.) to the Treatise on Piety (*Περὶ Ἐθιέσεως*), the name of Theopompus has probably been substituted for that of Theophrastus. Ruhnken. ap. Didot, in Frgg. Theop. p. LXXIV. The Tract called *Τρικάρανος* or *Τριπολιτικός*, a triple satire of great ability, on Athens, Thebes, and Corinth, vulgarly ascribed to Theopompus, and in which his rhetorical style seems to have been parodied, was written by Anaximenes of Lampsacus (one of the historians of Alexander), an enemy of Theopompus, and was maliciously circulated under his name. Pausan. vi. xviii.; Joseph. Cont. Apion. i. 24.; conf. Didot, op. cit. p. LXXIV.; Aristid. tom. i. p. 208. sqq., Jebb.

queror's principal officers; among others of Harpalus, one high in his confidence.¹ The title of Epistle also attached to some of his other discourses on miscellaneous subjects.²

EPHORUS,³

11. Son of Demophilus, was an Æolian of Cuma in Asia Minor. The only specific notice of his age is by Suidas, who describes him as coeval with Theopompus, the birth of each author having taken place about the year 403 B.C. The two are further stated by all authorities, to have been fellow-pupils under Isocrates. We learn from other indirect notices that both survived the accession of Alexander in 339 B.C. But there is no similar evidence of Ephorus having, like Theopompus, been still alive at the epoch of that monarch's death. In the one, as in the other case, modern commentators have disputed the date of Suidas on not unreasonable grounds; and would reduce the age of each historian by some twenty years.⁴ The principal arguments on either side of this question have already been considered in our memoir of Theopompus. It will here suffice to observe, that while several of those in favour of the more recent date for Theopompus, do not apply to Ephorus, the precise chronology of each writer, be-

His age.

¹ Fragg. 276—7.

² The mysterious *ἀρχαῖαι ἐπιστολαί*, for example, mentioned by Dionys. Halic.; and which have been a subject of much, but not very profitable discussion to modern commentators. See Müller ap. Didot p. LXIII.

³ Marx, *Fragmenta Ephori*; C. Müller, *Ephori Fragmenta*; ap. Didot, tom. I. p. LVII. sqq. 234. sqq. The fragments are cited according to Müller.

⁴ Müller, op. cit. p. LVII. sq.

yond the ascertained fact of his having been contemporaneous with Isocrates, Philip, and Alexander, is a matter of little real importance in its bearings, either on his own character or that of his compositions.

His education.

Ephorus is said to have been in his youth as remarkable for sluggishness, as Theopompus for vivacity of genius; hence the remark of Isocrates, that the one required the spur, the other the rein.¹ At the close of the customary course of lectures, so little had he profited by his master's instructions, that he was sent back by his father, with a request that he might be subjected to a further more diligent training; upon which Isocrates, punning on his pupil's name, jocosely observed that it might appropriately be changed into Diphorus.² Perceiving however that the youth possessed talent, slow as it might be of development, he took a warm interest in his subsequent studies; and on their successful completion, counselled him, as he had counselled Theopompus, though not it may be presumed for the reason alleged in the case of the latter, to cultivate history in preference to rhetoric.³ He further advised him⁴ to borrow his subjects from the older, more genial and poetical periods of national history, as better calculated to warm his phlegmatic faculties, than the more prosaic events of his own age. Little as Ephorus may have been distinguished by liveliness of fancy, he cannot in his maturer years be justly charged with mental torpor of any kind; for no

¹ Cicer. De Orat. III. 9.; Brut. 56.; Suid. v. Ephor. Plutarch, Vit. Isocr. p. 839.

² Cicer. De Orat. III. 13.; Seneca, De Tranquil. c. 6.

⁴ Phot. Cod. CLXXVI.

author of his time seems to have laboured more zealously, in the field of historical investigation which he had undertaken to cultivate. He was also a man of independent spirit; and declined an invitation to the court of Alexander, conscious of the trammels which royal patronage might impose on his freedom of research. Of the vicissitudes of his life no further notices have been preserved.¹

If Isocrates ever really counselled Ephorus to the effect above stated, regarding the choice of his subjects, the pupil has but imperfectly complied with his master's instructions. He has it is true commenced his "Histories," by which title alone his great work seems to have been known, with the early mythical annals of Greece. But his narrative was carried in continuous order through a period of about 750 years, to the siege of Perinthus by Philip, in 339 B.C.², a date of twenty-three years lower than that which closes the narrative of Xenophon. The work as quoted by the antients comprised thirty books. The last, or thirtieth, was attributed to his son Demophilus.³ The first fifteen or sixteen extended to the close of the Peloponnesian war, which epoch nearly coincided with the author's birth; so that the remaining thirteen, or little less than a half, were bestowed on the history of his own time.

His
historical
work

The first portion of the text embodied, apparently in the form of a Universal history⁴, the heteroge-

¹ Plutarch, De Stoic. Repugn. p. 1043.

² Diodor. Sic. xvi. 78.; Phot. loc. cit.; Polyb. iv. 3.

³ Diodor. xvi. 14. Demophilus is not cited as the author of any other work, nor is anything further known of his affairs: conf. Didot, Frgg. Histor. vol. II. p. 86.

⁴ Polyb. v. 33., who describes Ephorus as the first author of a work deserving that name.

neous elements, which the Pherecydes or Hellanici of the ante-Herodotean age, were accustomed to treat in separate and more desultory form. His more comprehensive work, like their *Archæologies*, *Genealogies*, or *Atlantides*, was a combination of mythology, geography, antiquities, statistics, and political history. Its main subject was concentrated on Greece, but in its earlier logographic stages it treated of every other part of the world, to such an extent as suited the author's taste. This more comprehensive character seems however to have been confined to the mythical or semi-historical periods. From the commencement of the Persian war downwards, his compilation appears to have become, like the closing books of Herodotus, very much a history of Greece in the proper sense. Ephorus also, if we may trust Diodorus, in so far professed to impart a strictly historical character to his labours, that he commenced his narrative with the Dorian conquest of Peloponnesus; an epoch generally recognised in later times, as the point of distinction between the mythical and the historical age. The further remark of Diodorus¹, that Theopompus overlooked the fabulous legends of the earlier previous period, is not certainly borne out by the fragments of the earlier books, the greater part of which are devoted to these same fabulous legends. Suidas, on the other hand, describes Theopompus, and doubtless, by reference to the extant citations from the earlier books, with more literal truth, as commencing his narrative with the Siege of Troy. The two statements may best be reconciled on the hypothesis, which seems also borne out by the internal evidence of the fragments, that

¹ iv. 1.

the events of the ante-Heraclidan age were treated in the mode of retrospective narrative or episode.¹

12. Of the six passages quoted from the first book², one described the amour of Hercules with the daughters of Thestius; another his voluntary slavery under Omphale; a third referred to the settlement of his sons in Doris; a fourth and fifth to the topography of the Troad and the neighbouring districts of Asia Minor. Of two others assigned on reasonable grounds to the same first book, one fixed the date of the destruction of Troy, the other detailed the genealogy of the Dardanian heroine Arisbe, her marriage with Paris son of Priam, and her foundation of the city of her own name on the Hellespont. An eighth fragment, also probably of this book, rates the life of the antient race of heroes at 1000 years, that of the Arcadian highlanders in the same primeval times at 300 years. A ninth narrated the abduction by Cadmus, of Harmonia daughter of Electra, from Samothrace; how, on her arrival with her husband at Thebes, she gave her mother's name Electra to one of the gates of the city, and how she continued to receive divine honours in her native island. From the remaining fragments it

Analysis
of its con-
tents.

¹ Diodorus (v. 1.) further describes Ephorus as having treated every part of his subject in its natural order, and in its distinct and united integrity; so that each book should be made up of a kindred set of materials; each being provided with a separate preface. He also intimates his approbation of this method, and that he had taken it as his own model. There can be little doubt that in this remark, he had tacitly in view the contrast, of what he may have considered the less practical Herodotean method, of interlacing different branches of subject with each other, by the elegant epic expedients of the Halicarnassian historian. Here again however, his main statement is hardly borne out by the light which the fragments afford on the contents of the separate books.

² C. Müller, *Frsg.* 8. sqq.

would appear, that the main narrative of the book described the Dorian conquest of Peloponnesus, and the distribution of the subdued territory among the victors.

The second book¹ treated the topography and mythology of Central Greece; Acarnania, Ætolia, Bœotia, Attica. It described the adventures of Alcmaeon the son of Amphiaraus during and after the second Theban war; the reasons why he took no part in the Trojan war, his occupation of Acarnania, and foundation of the Amphilochian Argos.

The passages quoted from the third book, relating almost exclusively to the topography of Ionia, can leave no doubt that its main subject was the foundation of the Ionian Colonies under Athenian leaders, by the ejected population of Peloponnesus.

The two following fourth and fifth books, with much apparent impropriety, by a prolonged interruption of the narrative, comprised a system of universal geography. The fourth, after a preliminary notice of the author's scheme of arrangement by Quarters, limates, or otherwise, treated the geography of Europe; hence familiarly quoted under the title of the *Europa*, or the description of Europe. The fifth contained the geography of Asia (exclusive of Lydia, the omission of which is censured by Strabo), and of Libya. Each book seems to have described the races by which the different countries were inhabited, with their religion, laws, and customs. The *Europa* appears to have been not only much the more bulky of the two, but to have occupied a large portion, perhaps a fourth of the entire work; that being the relation which the fragments probably assignable to this book²,

¹ Frg. 25. sqq.

² Frgg. 38—78.

bear to the whole existing collection. Among the longer quotations are accounts, of the foundation of the Delphic sanctuary, of the colonisation of Sicily, and the legislation of Zaleucus; with an elaborate treatise on the Cretan constitution, showing the system of Lycurgus to have been borrowed from Crete. The principal citation from the fifth book relates to Egypt. Ephorus attributed the overflow of the Nile to a gushing of water from the soil, owing to natural causes which he explains, during the great summer heat.¹

Resuming the interrupted thread of his narrative in the sixth book, he directs attention to Peloponnesian affairs, especially the Sparto-Messenian wars. The seventh book takes up the history of Cræsus king of Lydia, from whose reign Ephorus, like Herodotus, seems to have dated the first historically recorded rivalry between the political systems of Europe and Asia. The four or five citations of book nine relate chiefly to the topography of Asia Minor. With what propriety these topics could have been introduced here rather than in the Asiatic geography, does not appear.

The remainder of the work, judging from the fragments, was devoted chiefly to the authentic history of Greece; and treated its subject in continuous order. A due share of attention was also bestowed on Sicilian affairs, especially in their relation to Carthage.

13. There can be no doubt that this history contained a large quantity of really useful information and practical remark, on the varied subjects which it embraced. Ephorus seems to have been generally

His credit
as a histo-
rian;

¹ Frg. 108.: conf. C. Müller, *op. cit.* p. LX.

esteemed by the best native critics, not a brilliant or original, but a sound and discriminating writer. There is little trace of depth or novelty of research in his remains. Nor do his commentators allude to his having explored distant countries, or consulted recondite archives, native or foreign. His notions on obscure points of natural history or geography, show little advance beyond those of Herodotus or Hecataeus. He manifests however a laudable anxiety to draw from the best sources where easily accessible. Homer's works are kept constantly in view; and many of his illustrations of early history and geography, seem to have been in the form of commentaries on texts of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. He also quotes Hesiod, Alcman, Chœrilus¹, and other antient poets; and availed himself of the historical data supplied by monumental inscriptions.² His familiarity with the standard historical works of the previous generation, of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon³, may safely be assumed: but he pays no servile deference to their authority. His explanation of the causes of the Peloponnesian war contains some curious, not perhaps very probable particulars, unnoticed by Thucydides.⁴ On several points

¹ Frg. 76. 251.

² Frgg. 29. 121.

³ Frgg. 107. 111. 113. 129. 138.

⁴ Frg. 119. There is here no such wide discrepancy as some modern commentators (C. Müller, p. LXIII.) have supposed between Thucydides and Ephorus. In specifying the continued exclusion of Megara from free commerce with Athens, as the point on which Pericles made his stand against the pretensions of Sparta, Ephorus agrees both with Thucydides (i. 42. 67. 130. sq.) and Isocrates. The latter seems to consider this disagreement as the principal cause; Thucydides but as a secondary cause of the rupture. Admitting the details given by Ephorus of the special personal motives that induced Pericles to desire war, to be as little probable in themselves as they are creditable to that patriot,

where he differs from Herodotus or Xenophon, his authority has been preferred by subsequent compilers, and with justice, there can be little doubt, in so far as regards the latter historian. His account of the conspiracy of Lysander to effect a change in the Spartan law of royal succession¹, supplies an important chapter in the secret history of the Lacedæmonian republic, which like many other matters discreditable to Xenophon's favourite characters, has been suppressed in the *Hellenica* of that author.

The estimation in which Ephorus was held, as an authority on geographical subjects, appears from the extent to which he has been quoted and commented by Strabo, in every part of his great work.² Strabo, the "Hellenic geographer" by preeminence, was, still less perhaps than Ephorus, a man of deep original research. He was contented to borrow his materials from the more immediately accessible older authorities. But he certainly exercised critical discrimination in the choice of those authorities; and there is no one among them, as he himself informs us, to whom he pays greater deference than to Ephorus. Even the scrupulous care with which he notes and controverts what he considered his errors, is a proof of the value which as a general rule he attached to

as a geographer.

they yet possess value, as representing the views promulgated by the anti-Periclean interest in Athens, regarding the secret springs of his Peloponnesian policy. Thucydides, while assuredly not intentionally partial, is so profound an admirer of Pericles, as to render it possible at least that he may have taken too favourable a view of his motives. Ephorus also (frg. 144.) disputed the participation of Themistocles, which Thucydides seems to admit, in the treason of Pausanias; and described him as having taken refuge, not as according to Thucydides with Artaxerxes, but with his father Xerxes (frg. 115.).

¹ Frg. 127.

² Conf. C. Müller, p. LXIII. note.

his statements. Polybius¹ also dwells on the extent and precision of his investigations into the migration of colonies, the foundation of states, and the genealogy of their founders.

Ephorus has frequently been charged with error, or uncritical preference of the least authenticated versions of events, but never in any reasonable quarter, with wilful falsification. Nor is there any appearance of his having been unduly influenced by national or personal partialities², whether in the form of Laconism or Atticism. He did ample justice to the character of Epaminondas, his view of which contributed no doubt, with those of Callisthenes and other impartial contemporaries, to counteract the indirect calumnies of Xenophon. Plutarch mentions a man of his own circle of acquaintance, who by the perusal of a few books of Ephorus, had conceived so high an admiration for the Theban patriot, as to have become a pest or "bore" in society, from being unable to talk on any other subject, and hence himself acquired the nickname of "Epaminondas."³ One of the general rules prescribed by Ephorus for testing historical data, is sound and ingenious. "In regard to events of our own age, those authors who write most precisely are entitled to the greatest credit. But the greater the detail in which events of remote ages are narrated, the less trustworthy the narrator, owing to the less likelihood of any so copious reports

¹ XXXIII. 1. ; conf. Strab. x. p. 465.

² Auctt. ap. C. Müller, p. LXIII. No attention is due to the attacks directed against him, as against other respectable writers, by such promiscuous libellers as Timæus or Duris Samius.

³ De Garrul. 22.

"having been transmitted, of the words or acts described."¹ In the mythical portions of his own work his object seems to have been, not so much to gratify the national taste for the marvellous, as to reduce fabulous legend to what he considered historical fact, by aid of allegorical interpretation. In the application of these expedients, he does not seem to have been much more successful than the old logographers whose example he followed.²

Ephorus is cited as author of a work on Inventions in two books; of one on Local history, that of his own birthplace Cuma it may be presumed; and of a Treatise on literary style.³ The citations from the "Inventions" relate chiefly to the arts of music and poetry; those from the Local history exclusively to the biography of Homer and Hesiod. Ephorus was the principal authority for the Æolian version of Homer's life, which described him as born at Smyrna of Cumæan parents; as the offspring of an incestuous intercourse between his mother and her uncle and guardian Mæon, and as a first cousin of Hesiod, son of Mæon's brother Dius. The legends of the poet's mother's subsequent marriage to the schoolmaster Phemius, of his blindness, and consequent change of name from Melesigenes to Homeros, were also sanctioned by Ephorus.

His
secondary
works.

The treatise on Style seems to be cited, though not named, by Cicero and Quintilian, in their references

¹ Frg. 2.

² Frg. 70.

³ Frg. 158. sqq. 164. There appears no valid reason to doubt the genuine character of any one of these secondary works, as some modern critics have done; or to suppose with others, that the two former were parts or appendices of the author's historical composition.

to the views of its author on the proper adjustment of metrical cadence in prose composition.¹

His style.

The few literal extracts from the text of Ephorus, are in simple and perspicuous Attic style, conveying a favourable impression of this feature of his art of composition. The judgements formed by the ancients, on the more copious data at their disposal, are very conflicting.² Polybius describes his composition as greatly to be admired, for propriety of structure and clearness of argument; as abounding in ingenious maxims, and interesting illustrations. By Dionysius³ and Cicero⁴ it is commended for purity and perspicuity; but censured as diffuse, wanting in vigour, often languid and tedious. Hermogenes⁵, without specifying either merits or defects, ranks him among those authors whose style was to be taken by others, less as a model for their imitation, than as a warning of what they ought to avoid. Polybius⁶ eulogises his descriptions of sea-fights and naval operations as spirited and correct, and hence assumes that he must himself have had some experience of maritime affairs. His accounts of land engagements, on the other hand, especially those of Leuctra and Mantinea, are censured as full of blunders, proving his ignorance of the subject. This defect, Polybius further remarks, was common to other popular historians of the same age, but more prominent in Ephorus, owing to his fondness for

¹ Frg. 163.: conf. Theon, *Progymn.* p. 19., ed. Basil. Of the treatises, "On Good and Evil," and "On Paradoxes," mentioned by Suidas, no other trace is extant: conf. C. Müller, p. LXI.

² Auctt. ap. C. Müller, p. LXIII. sqq.

³ *De Comp. Verb.* XXXII.

⁴ *Orat.* 51. 57.

⁵ p. 403., ed. Porti.

⁶ Ap. C. Müller, p. LXIII.

enlarging on the details of military movements which he did not understand.

14. The historians of the Attic period, whose lives or works have not yet afforded material for separate treatment, are comprised in the subjoined list:¹

CRATIPPUS of Athens.
 SOPHÆNETUS [of Stymphalus].
 HERMIAS of Methymna.
 TIMONIDES of Leucadia.
 ATHANAS of Syracuse.
 DIONYSIODORUS and } Bœotians.
 ANAXIS }
 CEPHISODORUS [of Athens].
 ZOILUS of Amphipolis.
 DEMOPHILUS of Cuma.
 PHANIAS of Eresus.
 CLIDEMUS or CLITODEMUS [of Athens].
 PHANODEMUS.
 CALLISTHENES of Olynthus.

CRATIPPUS.

Of this author, the little that is known has already been incidentally noted in treating of Thucydides.²

¹ The "Historica" ascribed by Suidas to the tyrant Dionysius, and the work under the same title attributed by Diogenes Laertius to Aristippus the Cyrenaic philosopher, but neither of which are quoted by any other authority, cannot fitly claim a place in the catalogue. The *Ægyptiaca* of Aristagoras Milesius appear to have been purely topographical. Suidas, in ascribing to Theocritus, the cynical Chian rhetor of Alexander's time, a history of Libya, has evidently confounded his name with that of Theochrestus, a later writer of uncertain age, quoted by Pliny as author of a work under that title: conf. Müller in Didot, frg.; Hist. Gr. vol. II. p. 79. sqq. 86. 98.

² Supra, p. 50. sqq.

His Paralipomena of Thucydides.

He can hardly have enjoyed much general popularity; his work having been cited but three times; although devoted, under the title *Paralipomena of Thucydides*, exclusively to contemporaneous events.¹ It appears, from the extant notices, to have been a supplement to, and a commentary on, as well as a continuation of, the Attic historian's narrative: and to have extended down to Conon's victory of Cnidus. Two of the three citations contain notices of Thucydides; and the circumstance of Cratippus being the only ascertained contemporary, who has transmitted any information regarding that author or his work, forms his chief claim to such little celebrity as he enjoys. In the other, somewhat mutilated fragment, he appears to have ascribed the defacement of the Attic *Hermæ* to emissaries of the foreign enemies of Athens, to the Corinthians more especially, from their interest in the cause of their Syracusan kinsmen.

SOPHÆNETUS [OF STYMPHALUS]

is quoted four times by Stephanus of Byzantium, as author of an Expedition of Cyrus, or "*Anabasis*," and on points of Asiatic geography connected with the Persian prince's enterprise. The correspondence of names naturally leads to suppose, that he may be the same Sophænetus the Stymphalian, frequently mentioned by Xenophon, not always in the most honourable terms, as one of his colleagues in the command of the Retreat.² Yet it seems strange that an account of that memorable adventure, by a contem-

¹ *Frg. ap. Müller in Didot, vol. II. p. 75.*

² *Conf. Müller. op. cit. p. 74.*

porary, and leading participator in its vicissitudes, should not have been noticed by a single author of the flourishing age of Greek or Roman antiquity.

HERMIAS OF METHYMNA

is mentioned by Diodorus¹ as author of a "Sicula," His Sicula. or History of Sicily, which brought the affairs of that island down to the year 376 B.C., a date about ten years prior to the death of the elder Dionysius. The work is described by the same authority as consisting of ten, or according to another arrangement, of twelve books. The single extant citation of it², by Athenæus, alludes to transactions in the reign of Dionysius, of date 404 B.C. As this passage is quoted from the third book, the subject of the work would seem to have been limited to the more recent history of the island. It probably embraced the thirty-nine years from the Athenian invasion of Syracuse in 415 B.C., to the above-mentioned date, 376 B.C. If the first three books comprised the period from 415 to the close of the Peloponnesian war (404 B.C.), the first quarter of the ensuing century would be a reasonable allotment for the remaining seven books.

Hermias is also quoted as author of a geographical work (Periegesis), and of a tract on the Gryneum, or sanctuary of Apollo at Grynia on the coast of Æolis, opposite his native isle of Lesbos. His other works. From the tenor of a long citation of this treatise³, by the same Athenæus, it appears to have been a general disquisition on the worship of Apollo and his kindred deities, under the variety of forms which that worship assumed, whether at Grynia, or in his other more dis-

¹ xv. 37.

² Müller, *op. cit.* p. 80.

³ Müll. *loc. cit.*

tinguished sanctuaries. The precise age of this author has not been recorded. But the choice and treatment of his subject entitle him conjecturally to a place in the Attic period.

TIMONIDES OF LEUCADIA

His
epistolary
history.

was a friend of Dion of Syracuse, whom he accompanied on his expedition against the tyrant Dionysius the younger in 357 B.C. He was a disciple of the Academy, and wrote, or is believed to have written, an account of Dion's enterprise, in a series of letters to his friend Speusippus, a distinguished member of that institution, and successor to Plato in its presidency. Speusippus himself took a personal interest in Sicilian affairs, having accompanied his master Plato, when he visited Syracuse for the purpose of influencing Dionysius to a more rational course of government. Timonides bore an active share in the expedition, and was appointed to the command of the patriot force, at a time when Dion was himself disabled by a wound for the performance of his military duties. Antient authorities seem to have entertained no suspicion as to the genuine character of the letters ascribed to Timonides; which, if authentic, would be the first ascertained example of a historical narrative digested in epistolary form. Plutarch quotes them undoubtingly as genuine; and hence, in his life of Dion, attaches great weight to the authority of Timonides, as an eyewitness and participator in the events narrated. A passage of Plutarch, describing, after Timonides, the defeat, the subsequent cruel treatment, and death of Philistus, has been cited¹ in

¹ *Supra*, p. 505. : *conf. Müll. op. cit.* p. 83.

our memoir of that author. The existing remains supply no sufficient criteria for judging of the style of this composition.

ATHANAS OF SYRACUSE

wrote, in thirteen books, a history of the active life and government of his countryman Dion.¹ In a preliminary book he took a retrospective view of the seven years (363—357 B.C.) from the close of the work of Philistus to the commencement of his own; of the latter years, that is, of the reign of Dionysius the younger, the history of which had been left incomplete by his predecessor.

His Syracusan history.

Athanas is quoted with respect by Plutarch and Diodorus. As the two principal fragments of his work², both of some length, relate to the history of Timoleon, one of them to the blindness which preceded his death, it would seem that Diodorus speaks vaguely in restricting the subject of Athanas to the affairs of Dion. For Dion died in 353 B.C., sixteen years prior to the death of Timoleon in 337. The passages are hardly of such a nature as could reasonably have been introduced in mere episodical form, in a principal narrative treating of so much earlier a period. We possess no data for establishing the age of this author, beyond the fact of his having survived Timoleon. But the extracts from his text bear the stamp of notices by a contemporaneous writer.

DIONYSIODORUS and ANAXIS are classed together by Diodorus³, as two Bæotian authors who composed,

Dionysiodorus and Anaxis.

¹ Diodor. Sic. xv. 94.
VOL. V.

² Müller, op. cit. p. 81.
N N

³ xv. 95.

conjointly it must be presumed, a History of Greece, from what epoch is not stated, down to Philip's accession to the throne of Macedon. The only other notice of a Bœotian Dionysiodorus is by Arrian, who mentions a Theban citizen of that name, as in early life a victor in the Olympic games, and as having afterwards been sent by his native republic on a mission to the court of Darius Codomannus, about the time of Alexander's passage into Asia. In this capacity he was present with Darius at the battle of Issus, and was taken prisoner, but set at liberty by Alexander and allowed to return home. There seems no reason to doubt that Diodorus and Arrian refer to the same person.¹

Of his fellow-historian Anaxis nothing further is known; nor is there extant any distinct citation of their work.

Cephisodorus.

CEPHISODORUS is cited by a commentator of Aristotle, as author of a History of the Sacred War in twelve books; and the same authority quotes a passage of his work, describing a battle fought in the town of Coronea in 353 B.C., the fifth year of that war. No other notice occurs of a historian of this name. The work in question may hence the more probably be assigned to the Athenian orator Cephisodorus, a disciple of Isocrates, who composed, in vindication of his master against Aristotle, some rhetorical tracts, the style of which is much commended by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. He also wrote against Plato, but on what subject has not been recorded.²

¹ Müller, op. cit. p. 84.

² Müller, op. cit. p. 85.

ZOÏLUS of Amphipolis, the celebrated rhetor and Zoïlus.
anti-Homeric critic, is mentioned by Suidas and Eudocia¹ as author of three books on Amphipolis, his native city, and of a "History" from the origin of the gods to the death of Philip. Of these works or their contents no further notice is extant.

Of DEMOPHILUS, the son and continuator of Ephorus, all that is known has already been stated in our Demo-
philus.
memoir of the father.²

PHANIAS OF ERESUS,

15. a disciple of Aristotle and contemporary of Theophrastus, hence occasionally styled the Peripatetic, wrote on a variety of subjects³; and both the number and the tenor of the existing citations of his works, entitle him to rank among the more critical as well as popular authors of his time. He seems to have emulated Thucydides and Xenophon, in restricting his materials to real facts and events. His compositions belong however chiefly to the class of miscellaneous historical literature, rather than historical narrative. Eight works in all are ascribed to him. Of these the three which partake most of the strictly historical character are entitled: On the Prytanes of Eresus; On the Sicilian Tyrants; and On Tyrannicide from Revenge.

The first appears to have been a species of Universal history, chronologically arranged according to the succession of chief magistrates in the author's native republic. As the work is referred to under its proper title, but once alone in the forty extant His Ere-
sian Pry-
tanes.

¹ Müller, op. cit. p. 85.

² Supra, p. 531.

³ C. Müller, op. cit. p. 293. sqq.

citations of Phantias, it is the less easy to judge what passages, among the many where no title is specified, may belong to the "Eresian Prytanes." The compilers of the fragments seem however to have judged rightly in allotting to that work, as a general rule, all those of a properly historical tendency, which do not, from internal evidence or otherwise, more immediately connect themselves either with the "Sicilian Tyrants," or the "Tyrannicide from Revenge."¹ Of the eleven passages thus appertaining to the Prytanes, three relate to the legislation of Solon, and six to events in the life of Themistocles. Plutarch seems, in his biography of that distinguished Athenian, to have deferred to Phantias as a standard authority. Of the two remaining passages, one contained the author's calculation of the interval between the Dorian occupation of Peloponnesus and the expedition of Alexander, which he fixed at 715 years; the other, the only one of a mythical tendency in the author's remains, gives what may possibly be but an exaggerated version of a real phenomenon, the showers of fish, reported to have fallen on several successive days in the Thracian Chersonesus. The number of books into which the text was divided is not stated; but the second book is quoted, in the only fragment where the title of the work is specified.²

The citations from the "Sicilian Tyrants," and the "Tyrannicide from Revenge,"³ contain popular anecdotes of political usurpers, of the victims of their oppression, and the avengers of their crimes.

His other
works.

Of the remaining works of Phantias, two, On the

¹ Fragg. 1—11. ap. Müller, op. cit.

² Fragg. 1.

³ Fragg. 12—16.

poets, and On the Socratic Philosophers, belong to the miscellaneous order of historical composition. The former appears, from the few extracts¹, to have treated of music and musicians rather than of poets in the proper sense; that on the Socratics to have been a collection of familiar anecdotes rather than of biographical memoirs.² Phanias left several works of a rhetorical or controversial character; one of which was entitled "Against the Sophists;" also a Botanical treatise, of which fifteen fragments remain³, being more than a third of the whole collection. This would seem to imply that his authority was as great on scientific as on historical subjects.

CLIDEMUS.⁴

The principal work of Clidemus, also called Clitodemus, was entitled Atthis. The compositions bearing this name, partly owing to their number, partly to the interest of their subject, were classed by the grammarians as a separate branch of historical literature, and their authors are hence commonly quoted by the special title, Writers of Atthides. The name Atthis was also common to a kindred order of poetical composition in honour of Athens. The earliest recorded prose Atthis was that attributed to Melesagoras, a logographer of the age prior to the Peloponnesian war.⁵ The work of Helanicus, called by Thucydides his "Attic History," is also familiarly known in later times by the title Atthis. No composition of the kind having been

His Atthis.

Other
writers of
Atthides.¹ Fragg. 17, 18.² Fragg. 20—23.³ Fragg. 25—40.⁴ Siebelis, *Atthidum Fragmenta*, p. xxv. sqq.; C. Müller ap. Didot, *Fragg. Hist. Gr. tom. I. p. LXXXI. sqq.*⁵ See Vol. IV. p. 180.

preserved entire, we have the less means of judging as to the precise mode in which the common subject may have been treated. It would seem, however, that although the title was familiarly applied to any separate work on Athens, the *Atthis* in the proper sense was understood to embrace, not only a more or less detailed history of the Republic from the earliest period, but illustrations of her mythology and topography, of the manners and customs of her citizens, of her public monuments and principal institutions. Hence perhaps may be explained the description given by Pausanias¹ of Clidemus, as the earliest of those authors who treated the "local affairs of Attica." Pausanias could hardly have supposed him more antient than Hellanicus, or could have been ignorant that the latter author had written a work commonly entitled *Atthis*. It may therefore be assumed that the priority ascribed by Pausanias to Clidemus, refers, as its terms seem partly to imply, to the more peculiarly local or topographical character of the kind of *Atthis* which he introduced. Hellanicus on the other hand, as appears from the remains of his work, and from the notice of it by Thucydides, treated his subject, though very defectively, in a more enlarged Panhellenic spirit, and in connexion with the general affairs of Greece.² The distinction drawn by Pausanias, if indeed he can himself be understood to have had any such in view, does not seem to have been recognised by other commentators, who freely quote the older writers of *Atthides* in the same category as Clidemus and his successors.³

These later "*Atthidists*" were animated, as was natural, by a zealous spirit of partiality towards

¹ x. 15.

² See Vol. IV. p. 228.

³ See Appendix R.

Athens. Their efforts to sustain and extend her national honour were directed more especially to the object of making amends, by new or exaggerated versions of mythical legends, for the slender share of renown awarded to her, as compared with her neighbours Thebes and Argos, by the older, more genuine organs of heroic tradition. Clidemus, for example, asserted to Athens the possession of the Palladium, as having been captured by Demophon son of Theseus from Agamemnon, when he landed on the coast of Attica on his return from Troy.¹ The successors of Clidemus exhibited still greater zeal in appropriating to the Athenians, the credit of exploits attributed by less partial authorities to other heroes or countries.²

The age of Clidemus is nowhere clearly laid down; but as several authors of popular Atthides are ascertained to have flourished at the very commencement of the Alexandrian period, he may himself, as the most antient of his class, be considered as appertaining to the latter part of the Attic period. One of his fragments contains a notice of an event which took place in 375 B.C.; he must therefore have survived that year. No direct notice of his birthplace has been preserved: but the incidental allusions of his quoters leave little doubt of his having been an Athenian. Plutarch³ includes his name in a list of Attic writers, and Harpocration⁴ in the same indirect manner, characterises him as Attic in nation as well as in style.

The fragments of his Atthis, twelve books of which are mentioned, convey no high impression of the judgement of the author. They are devoted exclu-

¹ Müller, frg. 12.

² De Gloria Athen. l.

³ Siebel. pp. vi. xxvii.

⁴ γ. Πρῶκι.

sively to Athenian subjects, or subjects immediately connected with Attica. About one-half are occupied with the topographical or statistical antiquities of the city or state; some three or four alone with events of authentic history; the remainder with mythological fables, which are treated in no spirit of criticism, often with much "logographic" precision of detail. Clidemus is also mentioned as author of three works, entitled *Protogonia*, *Exegeticon*, and *Nosti*. But these titles denote probably parts or appendages of the *Atthis*, whether connected with it in the form of Introduction, of Commentary, or of Supplement. The citations of them imply that, like the *Atthis* in chief, they treated solely of Athenian affairs; and a statement cited by one author from the first book of the *Atthis*, is cited by another from the first book of the *Protogonia*.¹

Five passages on scientific, chiefly botanical subjects, are quoted by Theophrastus and Aristotle from Clidemus; whether from some professional naturalist of the name, or whether the author of the *Atthis* may also have occupied himself with scientific pursuits, are questions which no data exist for solving. No title, or other distinct notice has been preserved, of a work on natural history by an author of this name. The only other *Atthidist*, of similarly uncertain age and country, who may seem to possess a doubtful claim to a place in the Attic period is:

Phanodemus.

PHANODEMUS², whose works, from the number of extant citations, appear to have been popular in their day. They offer however little of novelty or interest

¹ Müller, p. LXXXVII. and frg. 3. : conf. 17.

² Siebelis, op. cit. p. VII. and p. 2. ; Müller, pp. LXXXIII. LXXXVII. p. 366.

to the modern student. His zeal for his own subject may be illustrated, among other examples, by his having magnified the number of Persian galleys opposed to Cimon in the battle of the Eurymedon, from the 350 or less partial authorities to 600.¹ Besides his *Atthis*, in nine or more books, he is quoted as author of one or two other works under less definite titles.

CALLISTHENES.

16. The only author, of the class familiarly styled Historians of Alexander, to whom, by an exception to the rule above laid down, a place will here be assigned among the writers of the Attic period, is Callisthenes.² To this privilege he is entitled on several grounds. His death took place prior to that of Alexander. His works consequently, at whatever date published, were all composed within the Attic period. The one devoted to the affairs of Alexander, in right of which alone, even had he survived that monarch, he could have ranked as an Alexandrian historian, forms but a limited portion of the whole; while the subjects treated in the others, in his *Hellenica*, and *History of the Sacred war*, are common in whole or in part to Xenophon, Theopompus, and Ephorus, the three most distinguished authors of the previous generation.

It is to his personal history, still more than to his literary productions, that Callisthenes is indebted for his celebrity. His connexion with Alexander, which resulted in his premature death, forms

¹ Frg. 17. Müller.

² C. Müller, *Fragmenta Scriptorum de Reb. Alexandri* (Didot), p. 1. sqq.; Sevin, in *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* tom. VIII. p. 126. sqq.; Ste. Croix, *Examen Crit. des Anc. Hist. d'Alexandre*, p. 34. sqq. alibi.

one of the most interesting chapters in Greek literary biography, and one of the darkest stains on the character of the most illustrious Greek warrior and conqueror.

His birth
and
parentage.

The father of Callisthenes was a citizen of Olynthus, a Greek colony of uncertain origin on the south coast of Thrace. His mother Hero was a near relative of Aristotle.¹ The date of his birth has not been mentioned; he appears however to have been by several years senior to his future patron Alexander, born in 356 B.C. He was adopted and educated from early boyhood by Aristotle; who when invited to the court of Macedon by king Philip, to superintend the education of his son and successor, carried with him his young kinsman.² He thus became the fellow-disciple and friend of Alexander, and after his accession to the throne continued to enjoy his confidence. Callisthenes does not appear to have united the profession of arms with his literary pursuits. We may hence the more readily adopt the account of Plutarch, that he took no part in Alexander's earlier Asiatic campaigns, but joined him at a later period, when he had already established his power in Western Asia, and his court had become the resort of enterprising Greek men of science.³

His connexion
with Alexander.

At whatever time he may have crossed into Asia,

¹ Plutarch, in Alex. 55.; Arrian, Alex. Anab. iv. 10.; Suid. v. Callisth.

² Justin, xii. 6.

³ According to Plutarch (Alex. 53., De Stoic. Repug. p. 1043.), his first visit to the camp was for the purpose of obtaining from Alexander the restoration of his native place Olynthus to its republican privileges. Suidas represents him as having accompanied Alexander: Justin (xii. 6.), as having been sent for subsequently, to act as chronicler of his patron's achievements. There is no evidence that he ever, as some ancient writers have conjectured, himself acted the part of preceptor to Alexander.

the previous friendly relations between him and Alexander continued for a time to be maintained. He is said, among his other scientific avocations, to have been habitually engaged with his patron and his fellow-courtier Anaxarchus, in studying the poems of Homer. According to some authorities, the celebrated edition of "the Casket" was the result of their joint labours.¹ But this amicable intercourse was not destined to be permanent; and there can be no doubt that the responsibility for its interruption rests, whether to his praise or to his discredit, in a great measure with Callisthenes himself. He seems to have been a man imbued with a genuine spirit of Panhellenic patriotism, little adapted to the region or the circumstances in which he was now called upon to act; of an honest and independent but, like Alexander himself, of proud, excitable, even arrogant disposition, and incapable of maintaining either his feelings or his language under prudential restraint.² Hence, on his first attaching himself permanently to the prince, Aristotle, who well knew the tempers which were to be brought into such dangerous contact, is said to have warned him, either to abstain from habitual freedom of discourse with his patron, or to shape his language in guarded and conciliatory forms.³ With this advice it was not in the nature of Calli-

His
character.

¹ Strabo, XIII. p. 594.

² Arrian (Anab. iv. 10.) represents him as no less vain of his talents than Alexander was of his conquests, and as having boasted that his patron would be more indebted for posthumous renown to the history of the Expedition which he, Callisthenes, was engaged in composing, than to his own achievements. But as Arrian is the zealous admirer and apologist of his own hero, and animated by no friendly feeling towards Callisthenes, we must be cautious in admitting his authority in such matters.

³ Auctt. ap. Muller, p. 3.

sthenes to comply. So intense indeed was the admiration with which he was at first inspired, by the generous bearing and brilliant achievements of Alexander, that his demeanour for a time resembled that of a sycophant rather than a friend or counsellor; and the bursts of exaggerated panegyric to which he gave vent in his history of the Expedition, undertaken at Alexander's request, have been justly censured, as well on moral as on literary grounds, by his biographers.¹ Nor can there be a better proof of the wayward inconsistency of his temper, than the contrast between the tone of these passages, several of which are still extant, and the spirit which he afterwards manifested towards his former object of veneration.

No estrangement seems to have taken place till after the murder of Clitus; on which occasion Callisthenes showed both judgement and fine feeling, in his efforts to allay the emotions of remorse, by which Alexander was affected, for this rash ebullition of ferocity. Yet his frank and honest mode of acting the comforter, is said to have damaged rather than improved his position in his patron's esteem.² When, in the sequel, the vainglory of Alexander obtained the entire ascendant of his better judgement, and repudiating altogether those Hellenic habits and feelings so dearly cherished by Callisthenes, he began freely to indulge in the vices, as well as the pomp and ceremonial of an Oriental despot, Callisthenes became as forward in marking his disapproval, or even his contempt, as he had lately been in his display of admiration.³ This conduct while, with his own unblemished

¹ Frgg. 25. 36. : conf. Timæi Frgg. 142, 143. Didot.

² Plut. in Alex. 52.

³ Plut. Alex. 53. ; Arrian, Anab. iv. 12.

course of life, it procured him the respect of the more generous portion of the conqueror's followers, was also viewed with satisfaction by the rival aspirants to royal favour, jealous from the first of the high place he occupied in Alexander's esteem, and who now rejoiced to find themselves provided through his own agency, with the means of subverting his influence. Of these enemies the most insidious and successful in his machinations was Anaxarchus, a man of talent, but a cringing self-interested sycophant, whom Callisthenes cordially despised, and whose hatred he had incurred, by habitually ridiculing and exposing the weak points of his character.¹

17. The interest taken by the Greek public in this His death. dismal episode of Alexander's history, is evinced by the copious commentaries for which it has furnished material to writers of all ages, and by the number and variety of the current anecdotes, as to the mode in which the quarrel was matured and brought to extremity. Many of these anecdotes are to all appearance ingenious fictions, devised for the purpose of enlivening the more gloomy features of the case. Such for example are those descriptions of the altercations between the king and the philosopher, where the innuendos and retorts assume the form of citations from Homer and other popular poets.² Among the more seemingly authentic notices, are those regarding the refusal of Callisthenes to perform certain degrading acts of homage³, required by Alexander from his courtiers, partly in his character of Asiatic despot, partly as due to the divine attributes to which he now laid claim, and which his parasites vied with each

¹ Plutarch, in Alex. 53.

² Plutarch, in Alex. 53. sq.

³ Arrian, Anab. iv. 11, 12.; Plutarch, in Alex. 54.

other in ascribing to him. By some authorities, the sarcastically insulting modes in which Callisthenes manifested his contempt for these debasing offices, and for the person who exacted them, has been considered as the sole or principal cause of his death. But other graver provocation was not probably wanting. Not content with manifesting his own views and feelings, he is said to have openly exerted himself in spreading them in the camp. This conduct naturally led him into confidential intercourse with malcontents of a more pernicious character than himself. A plot against the crown and life of Alexander was detected. The list of conspirators comprised several intimate associates of Callisthenes¹; a fact which, even in an impartial judge, might naturally raise suspicion of complicity in their designs. He was accordingly, in 328 B.C., arrested and thrown into prison. The accounts of his subsequent fate are so conflicting, that nothing can be distinctly gathered from them, beyond the fact of his never having come forth alive from his place of confinement. Some authorities² assert that, by the admission of Alexander himself in a letter to friends at home, not one of the convicted conspirators could ever be brought, by torture or persuasion, to impute to Callisthenes any actual concern in or knowledge of the plot. On the other hand, several of Alexander's principal officers³, in their memoirs of his life, asserted that Hermolaus and Sostratus, the two leading traitors, had charged Callisthenes with instigating them to their crime. Another subsequent letter is also quoted⁴, addressed by the king to Anti-

¹ Arrian, *Anab.* iv. 13, 14.

² Plut. in *Alex.* 55.

³ Ptolem. et Aristob. ap. Arrian, *op. cit.* iv. 14.

⁴ Plut. in *Alex.* 55.

pater, in which, after describing the convicted criminals as having been stoned to death by the indignant soldiery, he declares his intention of himself inflicting punishment on the Sophist, "and those who had sent him "out;" the latter expression being aimed at Aristotle. According to one contemporaneous account¹ he was, by Alexander's orders, executed, impaled or crucified, in prison. Another² describes him as having died of disease after a seven months' confinement in irons, awaiting the arrival of Aristotle, who had been summoned from Greece to be present at his trial before the royal tribunal.

Of the acts of cruelty or violence committed by Alexander, there is none which seems to have called forth a more general feeling of indignation in the public mind of Greece, than his treatment of Callisthenes. There can therefore be little doubt of its harshness and inhumanity. Theophrastus, between whom and Callisthenes a friendship had subsisted since the time of their fellow-discipleship under Aristotle, gave to his work *On Grief*, written it would appear in honour of his friend, and with immediate reference to his melancholy fate, the title "Callisthenes;" and Curtius, Cicero, Seneca, Themistius, with almost every other antient author who alludes to this transaction, if we except the conqueror's own special panegyrists, join in condemnation of his conduct.³ At the same time it can hardly be denied that there were palliating circumstances on the side of Alexander; that wanton provocation was given, and

¹ Ptolem. ap. Arrian, iv. 15.; Plut. Alex. 55.

² Plutarch, loc. cit.; Aristobul. ap. Arrian, loc. cit. For other accounts of still more inhuman treatment, see Müller, note 10. to p. 4.

³ Auctt. ap. Müller, p. 5.

that the indirect evidence of disloyal conduct on the part of Callisthenes, in his intimacy with the conspirators and his habitually disrespectful treatment of his sovereign, was specious to say the least.

His works. The historical works of Callisthenes were, I. a Hellenic History or "Hellenica;" II. a History of the Sacred war; and III. a History (or Memoirs) of Alexander. Two other works, "Macedonica," and "Thracica," quoted by writers of a late period and little authority, have been assigned with apparent reason, by modern commentators, to a more recent historian of the same name. Callisthenes was also author of a *Periplus*, or Coast-geography, of Asia Minor; and of several tracts on scientific subjects, the titles of which have not been distinctly recorded.¹

The *Hellenica*, in ten books, treated the period of thirty years, 387–357 B.C., from the peace of Antalcidas to the occupation of the Delphic sanctuary by the Phocians.² As this act was the immediate cause of the ensuing Sacred war, the other work of Callisthenes devoted to its history, was in fact a continuation of his *Hellenica*; the concluding event of the one series forming the commencement of the other. The author however was induced, as remarked by Cicero³, from the peculiar character of the subject, to constitute the latter series a separate narrative. The Sacred war lasted ten years. The two narratives

¹ Müller, p. 7. There are also attributed to him in the miscellaneous branch of literature, *Apophthegms*, *Metamorphoses* and *Cynegetica*. But these compositions also, in so far as they ever existed, may with better reason be assigned to other writers of the same name. Müller, loc. cit. The title *Persica* may be assumed, with Sevin, to be but a familiar mode of designating, in part or in whole, the History of Alexander. Müller, p. 6: *conf. frg.* 32.

² Diodor. XIV. 117., XVI. 14.

³ *Epist. ad Fam.* v. 12. 1.

therefore comprised jointly a period of forty years, terminating in 347 B.C. As but one, or at the most two fragments in the existing collection of Callisthenes, can be identified as belonging to the History of the Sacred war, that work would seem to have been composed on a more limited scale than his two other historical compositions, of each of which numerous citations have been preserved. No mention occurs of its division into books.

The History of Alexander was necessarily an unfinished work, the author's labours having been interrupted by death during its progress. If there be any truth in the account of Callisthenes having been specially selected by Alexander as his biographer¹, it may be supposed that the book was originally planned on a more comprehensive scale, to commence with the birth and education of its hero, and extend either to his death, or to the latest period of his life which the author himself lived to record. Judging however from the fragments, the portion published was limited to the Asiatic campaigns of Alexander. No notice occurs of his earlier achievements, either during his father's lifetime, or subsequent to his own accession. From the circumstance that Plutarch, and other writers who habitually defer to Callisthenes as an authority, cease to quote him on the affairs of Alexander after the battle of Arbela, fought in 331 B.C., it has been conjectured by modern commentators that he relinquished his undertaking about that time, owing to the alienation of feeling betwixt him and Alexander. Authorities however are agreed that no such alienation took place until after the death of Clitus, in 329 B.C. From a fragment of the Helle-

¹ Justin, XII. 6. : conf. Arrian, IV. 10.

nica¹, in which he alludes to his having accompanied Alexander on his visit to Ethiopia, in the same year 331 B.C. in which the battle of Arbela was fought, it appears that the *Hellenica* itself, probably his earliest undertaking, was at that date still incomplete. It is the less likely therefore, that during the few remaining years of his life, even apart from personal inducements to abandon his undertaking, he should have brought the *History of Alexander* to a state of maturity down to a lower epoch. On the same grounds of internal evidence it may be assumed, that neither the *Hellenica*, nor probably the *Sacred war*, were edited by himself, but were left, like the *History of Alexander*, for posthumous publication.

The works of Callisthenes appear to have been genuine reflexions of his ardent temper, and wayward genius. He is commended by Polybius² as a diligent and trustworthy historian, is quoted as such by authorities of all classes, and has been assigned a place in the Alexandrian canon of standard historical writers.³ His Hellenic history seems to have been one of the principal sources, to which subsequent compilers were indebted for facts carelessly omitted or wilfully suppressed by Xenophon. Such are the defeat of the Spartans at Tegyra⁴; the wresting of Messenia by Epaminondas from Lacedæmon, and her reestablishment as a separate independent state.⁵ His critical spirit manifests itself in his denial that Xerxes, as commonly believed, after his expulsion from Greece, engaged by treaty that no Persian vessel should approach within a certain distance of the

¹ Frg. 6.

² Montfauc. *Biblioth. Coisliniana*, p. 597.

³ Frgg. 3. 5.

⁴ Frg. 17.

⁵ Frg. 10. sq.

Greek coast. This Callisthenes asserts¹, and probably with reason, to be a popular error, founded on the fact, that the terror inspired by the destruction of his fleet, had induced the Great King spontaneously to shun, in the mode described, the risk of hostile collision with Greek ships in their own waters. Even the pains which have been taken by the more intelligent censors of Callisthenes to detect his errors, are a sort of indirect testimony to his general correctness. Polybius charges him with ignorance of military tactics, and with grave mistakes in his description of the battle of Issus, although himself present on the field. But the elaborate commentary in which the imputed blunders are examined, is itself a proof of the value attached by the critic to the authority of Callisthenes in ordinary cases.²

18. Whatever amount of judgement he may have shown in the treatment of his materials, he seems in their selection to have frequently been guided, like Theopompus, more by his lively fancy than by a sense of historical propriety. A large portion of the text of his longer more finished work, the *Hellenica*, appears from the fragments to have consisted of digressions, on matters extraneous to his proper subject. Of some twenty-three citations assigned with more or less reason by modern collectors to that work, five or six alone contain specific notices of facts or events belonging to the period of which it treats; several have a certain connexion with the main narrative, others are foreign to it altogether. Of the three passages³, for example, quoted from the ninth book, the principal subject of which was the last campaign of

His
Hellenica.

¹ Frg. 1.; Plutarch. Cim. 13. sq.

² Frg. 33.

³ Frgg. 15—17.

Epaminondas in Peloponnesus, one defined the precise year, month, and day, of the fall of Troy ; another described the honours bestowed by the Athenians on the family of Aristides, and the imputed bigamy of Socrates with one of that patriot's female descendants ; a third drew a comparison between the Spartan and Cretan constitutions. In treating of the Messenian policy of Epaminondas, he seems to have digressed largely on the legends of the old Sparto-Messenian wars ; on the heroism of Aristomenes, the treachery of Aristocrates, and on the vexed questions regarding the birthplace of Tyrtæus, his promotion to Spartan citizenship, and to the command of the Lacedæmonian army.¹ In the fourth book of the *Hellenica*, he controverted the prevailing opinions regarding the rise of the Nile. This phenomenon he ascribed² to the true cause, the tropical rains of Southern Africa, the influence of which on the stream he claimed to have ascertained by personal observation, when he accompanied Alexander on his expedition into Ethiopia. His detractors however alleged, but do not seem to have proved, that he was indebted for the doctrine to his master Aristotle, and had passed it off as his own. An opening for this digression may have been given, in his account of the Egyptian campaign of Iphicrates in 374 B.C.³

His His-
tory of
Alexander.

The History of Alexander seems to have diverged less widely or frequently from its own subject. It has indeed been assumed by recent commentators that the notices by Callisthenes, of the antient sieges of Sardis by the Cimmerians and by Cyrus, of the destruction of Miletus by the Persians in the days

¹ Frg. 10. sq.

² Frg. 6.

³ Diodor. xv. 41. sq.

of the poet Phrynichus, and many other passages on the geography and history of Asia Minor, were introduced in its text. There can however be little doubt, that the whole or the greater part of these fragments¹, have been allotted with better reason by the old collectors, to his *Periplus*, or Coast-geography of that region, than to any one of his properly historical works. The argument urged by the same critics against the genuine character of the *Periplus*, that no such work could have been composed by Callisthenes, because no circumnavigation of that coast had ever been undertaken by Alexander, is worth little. Nothing could be more natural, than that after the conqueror had obtained possession of Asia Minor, Callisthenes should have been led by his interest in that country, both as a man of science and a Homeric commentator, to avail himself of the new facilities of research with which he was thus provided, in exploring and describing its objects of curiosity. His descriptions would, according to the fashion of the age, naturally assume the form and title of a *Periplus*, although he may never, in the literal sense, have circumnavigated the countries described. Other passages which would have been excrescences on his historical works, but appear as highly appropriate illustrations of a topographical tour, are his commentary on the battle of the Eurymedon², and his dissertations on speculative points of Homeric topography.³

His
Periplus.

Modern commentators have been similarly hasty, in dismissing as spurious the properly scientific works ascribed to Callisthenes. It is not easy to explain how he could have been habitually designated "the

His scientific works.

¹ 20. sqq., 27. sqq., 31. 39.

² Frg. 1.

³ Frg. 28, 29.

Philosopher," by Cicero, Plutarch, Seneca, and other authorities, or how his opinions should have been quoted on physiological questions, unless he had left some more distinct record of them in writing, than a few incidental passages of his works on history. It seems therefore unreasonable to set aside, as has been done in some quarters, the testimony of Pliny and other respectable classics¹, who quote him as the author of scientific tracts. To these tracts assuredly, with better reason than to his historical compositions, may be assigned his speculations² on the causes of the natural convulsions which destroyed the Achæan cities of Bura and Helice, and on the physical peculiarities of situation or soil, which rendered Delos less subject to earthquakes than other neighbouring islands.

His treatment of
mythology.

While the main subject of each of his principal works seems to have been restricted to real history, the mode in which mythical legend was introduced in their illustrative element, proves that in this department of criticism he was not greatly in advance of the popular public of his day. In connexion with the battle of Tegyra, he advocated the claims of the sanctuary of Apollo in that town to be the birthplace of the god, as preferable to those of rival seats of worship. Among other essays in etymological interpretation, he derived the celebrated title of Minerva, Tritonis, from the Third ("tritē") day of the month, on which the goddess was born. The portentous omens which at Sparta, Thebes, and elsewhere, fore-

¹ Ap. Müller, p. 8.

² Frg. 8. Seneca's expression, "in libris," here certainly applies more naturally to miscellaneous treatises, than to the "books" of a historical work: *conf.* Müller, p. 8.

shadowed the battle of Leuctra, seem to have been carefully described.¹ In his account of the visit of Alexander to the Temple of Ammon, under the influence of his then fervid admiration of the hero, he related, apparently with pious faith, the providential interpositions vouchsafed to the newly recognised son of Jupiter, on his hazardous march across the desert, and the miraculous phenomena which, even in distant regions, signalised the establishment of his claim to divine honours. He describes more especially how the Milesian oracle of Apollo at Branchidæ, which since the spoliation of its sanctuary by the followers of Xerxes, had been dumb, suddenly recovered its voice; how the sacred fountain which had ceased to flow, again sent forth her waters; and how messengers arrived at Memphis from Miletus, charged with congratulatory addresses from the god to his Macedonian brother, and with prophetic announcements, by himself and the neighbouring Erythræan Sibyl, of the approaching victory of Arbela, of the death of Darius, and the removal of other obstacles to his illustrious kinsman's empire of the world.²

The fragments of Callisthenes contain no literal His style. extracts from his text, of sufficient compass to afford a just criterion of his style. His master Aristotle describes him as powerfully eloquent in speech³; and Cicero⁴ characterises his style as rhetorical, but not otherwise marked by salient peculiarities. Longinus⁵ represents his efforts to be dignified or sublime as resulting in affectation or bombast; defects for which he is severely lashed by the censorious Timæus. The panegyrical passages on Alexander, cited by that his-

¹ Frgg. 3, 4. 27. 9.² Frg. 36.³ Plutarch, Alex. 54.⁴ De Orat. II. 14.⁵ De Sublim. 3.

torian and by Arrian, go far no doubt to justify this severity of criticism. In one place he described the sea, during Alexander's march along its shore, as "rising from its seat on perceiving his approach, and "by the bending of its waves, performing its act of "obeisance to him whom it recognised as its king." But this excess of hyperbole seems to have been confined chiefly to his commentaries on Alexander's affairs, when in the acme of his veneration for that monarch. No notice occurs of his employment of such figures in any other part of his works. Had he lived to complete his undertaking, he would doubtless, in the altered state of his feelings, have altered or expunged such passages. The fact of their having been allowed to remain in their naked absurdity, seems to imply that the book, as posthumously edited, was in so unfinished a state, as hardly to represent with fairness, either the matured opinions or the corrected style of its author.

A P P E N D I X.

APPENDIX A. (Page 21.)

ON THE POPULAR ERRORS IMPUTED BY THUCYDIDES TO HERODOTUS.

THE question how far these two statements may have been justly condemned as fabulous by Thucydides, while it has no necessary bearing on the argument of the text, possesses interest, as affecting the credit of each historian. It has been far too generally assumed by commentators, that because the correctness of Herodotus in regard to a matter of fact has been impugned even by so formidable an opponent, he must necessarily be in the wrong, and his censor in the right.

§ 1. In his account of the battle of Plataea, Herodotus¹ has occasion to notice the conduct of Amompharetus, a Spartan officer, whom he designates as chief of the Pitanae lochus or cohort. Thucydides² asserts that there was no such thing as a Pitanae cohort in the Spartan army. It is not unlikely that both authors may be right. There may not have been a cohort to which the name of Pitanae permanently attached; which broader view of the case was evidently the supposed error condemned by Thucydides. But it is quite possible that a portion of the army at Plataea, whether from the men belonging chiefly to the demus of Pitana, or from some other incidental cause, may at the time of the battle have been distinguished by the title of Pitanae. As Herodotus³ had visited Pitana, and was acquainted with some of its principal inhabitants, he was the less likely to be grossly mistaken in any matter connected with its affairs. An apt illustration of this view is supplied by Thucydides himself. In his account of the battle of Mantinea, he designates a portion of the Spartan army there

¹ IX. 53.

² I. 20.

III. 55.

engaged by the title of "Brasideans."¹ It is certain however that no division of the Spartan army ever properly bore this name. The troops in question are so called by Thucydides, merely because they had lately fought under Brasidas in Thrace. It is quite possible that the lochus of Amompharetus at Platæa, may have been in like manner, from some cause unknown, temporarily designated by the title of Pitane. A captious critic of Thucydides might thus perhaps, with similar right, have imputed ignorance to him, in asserting that the Lacedæmonian army contained a division entitled Brasidean. In the same way the remnant of the "Ten thousand," who afterwards formed part of the Lacedæmonian force under Thimbron and Agesilaus, were called Cyreians², from their previous campaign in the service of Cyrus; further proof how common such occasional surnames were in the Lacedæmonian military service.

§ 2. With regard to the other imputed error of Herodotus, his ascribing two votes in council to the Spartan kings, while there can be no reasonable doubt that Thucydides had the text of his predecessor in view, it is still open to question, whether the sense in which he, followed by commentators antient and modern, has construed the passage, is a fair one. The primary object of Herodotus certainly is to show, not that each king had any particular number of votes, but that both possessed the privilege, when absent, of voting by proxy; and to explain the mode in which that privilege was exercised. "If," he observes³, "the kings should 'not attend, the senators next of kin had the power to act for 'them, by lodging their two votes in addition to their own.'" Whether this means two votes for each of the kings, or a single vote for each, does not distinctly appear. The balance of probability is however, on the whole, in favour of the latter interpretation.

APPENDIX B. (Page 23.)

ON HIPPIAS AND HIPPARCHUS.

WE have in the text been content to acquiesce in the commonly received opinion, that Herodotus and Thucydides were

¹ v. 71.

² Xenoph. Hellen. III. ii. 7. 18. alibi.

³ VI. 57.

at one upon this genealogical question ; that the credulity therefore, which Thucydides here imputes, cannot be that of Herodotus. But a zealous controversialist might perhaps find an opposite argument on two other passages, in which the latter historian mentions the Pisistratidæ. In one¹ he remarks, that the Alcæonidæ are, in his opinion, better entitled to rank as the liberators of Athens, than were Harmodius and Aristogiton, "who, by killing Hipparchus, merely irritated the rest of the "Pisistratidæ, but did not prevent them from reigning." In the other² he tells us, that Onomacritus "was banished from Athens "by Hipparchus;" having been detected interpolating spurious verses on the oracles of Musæus.

The natural interpretation of the former passage, if it stood alone, would be, that Hipparchus himself had reigned, as well as "the rest" of the race whom he left behind; that Harmodius, by killing one tyrant, had but added harshness to the despotism of the other. The import of the second passage is more directly to the above effect. What power could Hipparchus have had to banish an Athenian citizen, unless he had been at least the colleague in office of his brother? If Herodotus knew Hippias to have been the sole ruler, he would surely have modified his statement to the effect, that "Onomacritus had been banished by Hippias at the "instance of Hipparchus." Taking the whole three passages, v. 55., vi. 122., vii. 6., in the aggregate, their tenor is at least ambiguous, and implies Herodotus to have been so little clear in his views, that a captious commentator might have felt as well entitled to charge him with participation in the vulgar error, as his admirers to assert his freedom from it.

There is indeed great reason to believe, that if the popular opinion was wrong, Thucydides has run into an opposite error in his condemnation of it, and that the truth lies between the two, Hippias and Hipparchus having reigned conjointly. In a portion of his commentary on these events, he himself appears plainly to write under the impression that such was the case, at variance as that impression is with his own argument. The terms of the subjoined passage³, unless Hipparchus had been a reigning prince, either singly or as colleague of his brother, are, it need scarcely be remarked, altogether senseless: "Nor was he (Hipparchus) "an oppressor of the people, in regard to his general course of

¹ VI. 122.² VII. 6.³ VI. 54.

"government, which he conducted to the public satisfaction. For "these tyrants were distinguished both for virtue and talent."

Apart from positive testimony, it is not easy to understand how the murder of a younger brother of a reigning despot, not only without any damage to the power and resources of that despot, or any benefit to the community, but on the contrary, with positive injury to their interests, by rendering, as Thucydides pointedly remarks, the despotic rule more cruelly oppressive than before, should have obtained for the author of so useless and mischievous an act, the reputation, even among the people at large, of an illustrious patriot. There can therefore be little doubt, that the author of the beautiful and probably contemporaneous ode in honour of that act, is right in his line: *ὅτε τὸν τύραννον κτανέτην*, though wrong in the immediately following verse *ἰσονόμους τ' Ἀθήνας ἐποιησάτην*.

APPENDIX C. (Page 54.)

ON THE DIVISION OF THUCYDIDES INTO BOOKS.

THE scholiast on II. 78., describes that passage, as the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth book, of the division into Thirteen. The scholiast on III. 116. of the present division, describes the end of that book as the end of the fifth book of the Thirteen. The scholiast on IV. 78., places at that passage the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh of the Thirteen. Another scholiast (IV. 114.) appears to cite the speech of Brasidas to the Acanthians in IV. 85., as from the "sixth" book (*τῇ ε'*). These two authorities therefore are, as now read, at variance with each other.

An anonymous grammarian quoted by Walz (Rhet. Gr. vol. VII. pt. i. p. 16.), cites the punning antithesis, *μὴ φρονήματι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ καταφρονήματι*, in II. 62. of the present division, from the "third" book (*ἐν τῇ γ'*). This citation, if referring to the tredecimal division, would be in harmony with the statement of the scholiast on II. 78. as above quoted. It were hence natural to infer, that the citation by the same anonymous writer in his immediately previous text, of the passage of I. 122. *ἐπὶ τὴν πλείστον βλάβαν καταφρόνησιν*, from the first book, also refers to the first of the

Thirteen. It would follow that the second of that division was comprised between i. 122. and the close of the same first book. For the scholiast on iv. 135. describes the present first book as comprising the entire first and second of the Thirteen.

APPENDIX D. (Page 55.)

ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EIGHTH BOOK.

THE more detailed consideration of the questions regarding the eighth book has been reserved for this place, as involving points of a more technical nature than could be fitly discussed in our principal text.

With respect to the genuine character of the book, the arguments which have been or may be urged on the negative side are: I. The absence of the Speeches, which abound in the previous seven. II. The comparative freedom of the text from the rhetorical mannerism, especially from the antithetical quaintness of structure, elsewhere characteristic of the Historian's style; and which, while chiefly remarkable in his speeches, are also frequent in other portions of the first seven books. III. The recurrence of numerous terms not elsewhere used by Thucydides, or even of integral passages little in unison with his prevailing style.

The main arguments on the other side are: I. The absence of all appearance of doubt as to the genuine character of the book, on the part of the leading native grammarians. Dionysius of Halicarnassus observes, that "whoever carefully compares the first and the last book with each other, will be sensible of much diversity, both in their design and their execution."¹ This observation refers not to different authorship, but to anomaly in the genius of a single author. The first allusion to a different opinion is by Marcellinus. He remarks however that the sceptical view was not countenanced by the best critics, who recognised the book as the work of Thucydides, though inferior in vigour and variety of style to the others. This inferiority he attributes to the disease which afflicted the author at that stage of his undertaking, and terminated in his death.

¹ De Thud. Juc. 16.

II. Notwithstanding the comparative scantiness of rhetorical matter, the book is everywhere marked by the other more essential attributes of Thucydidean style, which it is difficult to believe any copyist could have been qualified to impart to it. III. The extent and precision of the author's insight into the transactions recorded, were scarcely credible in the case of any author, unprovided with the Historian's peculiar talent for such researches, and facilities for their prosecution. IV. The abruptness with which the narrative breaks off in the middle of the year and of an unimportant transaction, is an anomaly easily accounted for in the case of an author whose labours had been suddenly terminated by death, but not on the part of a professional bookmaker, in what he wished to pass off as an integral section of a great work by an accomplished writer. Nor is it likely that one qualified so well to imitate his model, would have limited his spurious supplement to the transactions of a short additional period, and of a comparatively dry and monotonous nature, instead of carrying it on to the great catastrophe which the original author had undertaken to record. The omission of the speeches were also, in an attempt to counterfeit a work abounding in such matter, a still stranger anomaly than on the part of the original author.

While on these grounds the genuine origin of the book may confidently be asserted, the want of speeches, with such other discrepancies as are observable between its style and that of the previous seven, may best be explained, by assuming it to have been left by Thucydides in an unfinished state, and revised for posthumous publication by another hand. Several of those discrepancies are also of a tendency, not only to bear out the tradition preferred in our text, that the posthumous editor was Xenophon, but to justify the belief that he has, in some cases, given an undue extension to his editor's privilege of amendment or supplement to the original materials.

The abruptness with which the narrative of the eighth book closes, or rather breaks off, has already been noticed, as indicating the sudden termination, from whatever cause, of the Historian's literary labours. There is however a certain peculiarity about this abruptness, which is not so easily accounted for by that more simple cause. If there be a passage in the work of Thucydides which deserves to be struck out as repugnant to his own genius, or which on equally strong grounds of harmony with the genius of Xenophon, might claim a place in the *Hellenica* or the *Anabasis*,

it is the last sentence of this book, in which Tissaphernes is described as having gone down to Ephesus, "and offered sacrifice to "Diana." One of the most prominent characteristics of Thucydides, is the indifference, or even contempt, which he everywhere manifests for the superstitious rites of his nation. In no other instance has the performance of sacrifice by any one of his leading actors, been mentioned by him as an object of interest on its own account. On the few occasions where notices of the kind occur, it will be found that they have been in some degree forced upon him, as essential to a right understanding of historical events.¹ Nowhere has he himself been at pains, as here, to force them upon his readers. The more strange therefore that, at the moment when his literary functions were brought to a close, he should have been engaged in writing a passage so much at variance with his own character, or with anything he had ever previously written.

The feeling and habit of Xenophon in this respect was notoriously the reverse of that of Thucydides. He was, not even excepting Herodotus, the most pious of Greek historians. With him all kinds of religious observance, but more especially the rite of sacrifice, rank among the most important duties of a citizen or a soldier. The notices consequently of such observances, as in themselves vitally important affairs, abound, in forms similar to that here in question, in all his historical works.

Xenophon having been, not merely as here supposed the posthumous editor, but the ascertained continuator of this book, its abrupt conclusion would be the portion of the text, which if it did not render necessary a certain amount of addition or alteration on the editor's part, would hold out the greatest temptation to such

¹ In his account, for example, of the stratagem by which Brasidas outgeneraled Cleon in the second campaign of Amphipolis (v. 10.); and in v. 54., where Agis suddenly turns back from his expedition into Arcadia, owing to the sacrificial rites proving inauspicious.

Elsewhere (v. 49, 50.) he mentions the exclusion of the Spartans by the Eleans from the common privilege of sacrifice at Olympia, as an insult involving historical consequences; and in v. 53. he alludes to a similar quarrel between the Argives and Epidaurians, regarding the common worship of Apollo.

His few remaining notices of such ceremonial, some four or five in number, occur, either incidentally in the course of his antiquarian illustrations, or in the addresses of historical personages to each other: I. 126., VI. 3. 54., II. 71., IV. 92.

license. Let us suppose then, that the narrative of Thucydides originally terminated with the simple announcement of the determination of Tissaphernes, for reasons given, to proceed to the Hellespont; with the word *ἀπολογήσθαι* consequently, of the present text. Let us suppose further, that Xenophon, when he undertook the redaction of this unpublished part of the work, simultaneously in all likelihood with the first part of his own Hellenica, had learnt, among other facts supplementary to the concluding statement of his predecessor, that the Persian satrap had made Ephesus the first stage of his journey, and had, on arrival, offered sacrifice to the great goddess of that city. This was an event to which Xenophon would not fail to give due prominence. Proof of the importance he would attach to it is supplied by his reference, in the immediately ensuing narrative of the Hellenica, to the veneration entertained by Tissaphernes for this deity¹; by the allusions in his other historical work to the respect paid to her by other Persians²; and by his own special devotion to her as his patron goddess, also largely illustrated in his Anabasis.³ Having decided therefore on noticing the fact, the question would arise, whether the notice should be appended to the interrupted narrative of Thucydides, or introduced at some convenient place in the opening of his own continuation. His preference of the former mode, if it has fastened an inappropriate excrescence on the genuine text of his predecessor, certainly contributes to the epic connexion between the two narratives. Following up the general statement by Thucydides, of the satrap's intention to visit the Hellespont, he carries him so far on his journey, and there, according to the familiar courtesy of epic style, leaves him for the present, engaged in performing what Xenophon considered an important duty; while the subsequent train of events at the seat of war, whither the satrap was journeying, is brought down in the Hellenica, to the moment when his arrival took place, as duly announced in the sequel.

Other indications of a strange hand in this book are the numerous expressions not elsewhere used by Thucydides, but by far the greater part of which, amounting to some thirty or upwards, are

¹ i. ii. 6.

² Anab. i. vi. 7. The Persians, it is well known, relaxed their general dislike of the Hellenic system of idolatry, in favour of Apollo and Diana; owing to the peculiar relation in which, as Sun and Moon deities, they stood to the Persian religion. See Herodot. vi. 97.

³ v. iii. 4. sqq.

in familiar use with Xenophon. It is also remarkable, that these Xenophontean terms are not only interspersed through the eighth book, but often concentrated in particular passages of it, the general style of which savours perhaps as much of Xenophon as of Thucydides. Examples are subjoined :

The passage of § 92. from τὸ δὲ μέγιστον το διαθέοντας, contains six expressions : στίφος, ἀπειλέω, ὁμογνώμων, νεανίσκος, ἐκπληκτικός, διαθεῖν, which, while frequently used by Xenophon, occur in no other book of Thucydides. The absence of such more familiar terms as ἀπειλεῖν or νεανίσκος, from the text of the latter, might reasonably be attributed to accidental causes. But this explanation can hardly apply to the four others, as belonging nearly as much to the class of idiomatic as of ordinary phraseology. In regard to στίφος, it may be observed that Thucydides elsewhere invariably uses the term ὄχλος (upwards of twenty times), in describing the feelings or doings of the mass of common people or soldiery ; while with Xenophon both terms are habitual.

In the five lines (§ 84.) from ὁ δὲ αὐθαδέστερον το διελύθησαν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ; the terms αὐθαδής, ἀπειλεῖν, ἐπαναίρεσθαι, βακτηρία, are Xenophontean, but not beyond the limits of this book Thucydidean expressions.

In the opening passage of the book, a portion of the text which, like the close, would be the more liable to editorial tampering, the idiomatic phrases ὁ πάνν, and πασσνδί, are not elsewhere used by Thucydides, but occur, the latter repeatedly, in Xenophon. Εὐτακτεῖν, toward the close of the same first section, a common phrase with Xenophon, appears but this once in Thucydides.

The verb εὐδαιμονεῖν, also of frequent use with the former historian, is found in Thucydides but in a single passage of this book : εὐδαιμονήσαντες ἡμα καὶ ἰσωφρόνησαν ; where it also occurs in a combination of ideas familiar to Xenophon, as appears from the following text of the Agesilaus : εὐδαίμονα τὴν πατρίδα, ἰσχυρὰν δὲ, ὅταν οἱ Ἕλληνες σωφρονώσιν.

The somewhat peculiar phrase ἀνυγκροτήτοις πληρώμασι, of § 95. finds its parallel in the Hellenica, συγκεκροτημένας ναῦς, VI. ii. 12.

A list of other expressions peculiar to this book of Thucydides, and for the most part occurring in one passage alone of its text, but of more or less familiar use with Xenophon, is here subjoined :

VOL. V.

P P

ἀναδέχασθαι, ἀβρώστοτερος, γνώριμος, διαφθορά, διοικεῖν, διοικήσεις, εκπράσσειν, ἐξαναγκάζειν, ἐπικρύπτεσθαι, ἐπιφαίνεσθαι, ἐφήκειν, ἡσυχῇ, κατατρίβειν, μόνιμος, ναυαρχία, ξυνεπιμελεῖσθαι, παράγγελμα, περι-οπτέον, ὑπερόριος.

APPENDIX E. (Page 71.)

ON THE RELATION OF ATHENS AND LACEDÆMON TO THEIR WEAKER ALLIES.

THE general dearth of political honour and faith during this period, is mainly relieved by two cases of steady adherence to engagements, and chivalrous devotion in their fulfilment: the sieges of Platæa and Melos.

The Spartans, before investing Platæa, offered the citizens reasonable terms of accommodation. These however, as involving neutrality in the impending war, the Platæans declined, until they had consulted their old allies the Athenians. The answer from the latter was an injunction to persevere in resistance, with an assurance of effective support.¹ But throughout the ensuing three years of calamitous siege, we hear of no attempt by Athens to relieve the unfortunate garrison, who in their dying address allude, in pathetic terms, to their desertion by their friends in their last extremity.

The rejection by the Melians of the terms of submission proposed by the Athenians, is grounded in like manner on a sense of their obligation towards their Spartan kinsmen, from whom they confidently expect relief.² But during the ensuing half-year of gallant defence, terminating in their surrender and massacre, there is no trace of the Lacedæmonians having taken any concern or interest in their affairs.

The disastrous Mytilenæan revolt from Athens, was abetted by the Spartans, and a fleet of forty ships was dispatched, ostensibly to support the islanders in their defence. But the account given³ of the voyage of that fleet, of the conduct of its commander, and of the Spartan government in the sequel, abundantly shows, that if it ever was their intention to risk Lacedæmonian life

¹ II. 72.

² v. 104. sq.

³ III. 20.

or resources, in emancipating Mytilene from Athenian bondage, they had seen occasion to alter their policy during the progress of the siege. Conduct like that of Alcidas, discountenanced as it was by his Elean colleague, would assuredly, in an enterprise the success of which the Spartans had seriously at heart, have been visited with heavy penalties. It passes uncensured and unnoticed; and the best proof that no blame was attached to it, is the fact of Alcidas having been immediately afterwards sent in command of the same fleet on another important expedition. (III. 76.) The Spartans probably acted on the afterthought that, even if the emancipation of Mytilene was effected, the obligation to maintain a distant maritime ally against the then unquestioned naval superiority of Athens, would be more trouble than advantage; and hence, that Mytilene would serve them better as a discontented and doubtful dependency of the enemy.

But the worst case of the whole, is that which forms the catastrophe of the joint expedition of the Spartans and Ambracians against the Amphiloehians. After the defeat by Demosthenes of the invading force, Menedæus, the surviving Spartiate commander, secretly makes separate terms with the victors, to the effect, that he shall be allowed to retire in safety, on condition of his leaving the Ambracians, and his other provincial confederates to their fate. The latter accordingly are attacked and destroyed on the ensuing day, and their betrayers return unmolested to Peloponnesus.¹

APPENDIX F. (Page 128.)

ON THE DEFECTS OF EPIC MANAGEMENT IN THUCYDIDES.

THE retrospective narrative of the forty-six years from Sestus to Epidamnus, begins with an announcement of the author's intention to explain, how the Athenians had attained that alarming degree of power which led the Lacedæmonians, in the council just before described, to decide on war. Thucydides then relates in continuous order, the refortification of Athens; the attack by the confederate Greek fleet on Cyprus; the taking of Byzantium; the transfer of the

¹ III. 100.

maritime Hegemonia from Sparta to Athens; and the establishment of Athenian supremacy over the colonial states.¹ But here the narrative is interrupted, to make way for the author's explanation of the reason why he had undertaken it; an explanation which, if required at all, ought surely to have been given at the outset. The exordium has, in fact, been thrust into the middle of the piece, instead of forming its commencement. It is evident therefore that the passage from ἔγραψα δέ, to the end of section 97., or at least the information which that passage supplies, ought to have been the introduction to § 89. The retrospect from the siege of Sestus to the Epidamnian war, would thus have formed a continuous and well-united whole. By the present arrangement it has, (like the whole fifty years' retrospect of which it forms part,) been unnecessarily cut into two separate narratives, the one commencing (§ 89.) οἱ γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι; and the other (§ 98.) πρῶτον μὲν Ἱστορα. . . .

A like defect is observable in the episode of the last days and death of Pausanias. This narrative in its integrity embraces: the traitorous conduct of its hero, when in command of the Hellenic fleet on the Bosphorus, and his recall to Lacedæmon; his subsequent expedition on his own private account to the same region, and his renewed intrigues with the Persian court, which led to his second summons back to Sparta, and ultimately to his impeachment and death. But Thucydides here again reverses the order of events, and plunging "in medias res," opens the subject with a brief notice of the second (private) expedition to Thrace (i. 128.). He then, in the form of a retrospective episode, describes in great detail the treason of the previous Byzantine campaign; after which the second expedition is resumed (§ 131.) and narrated to its close with its ulterior consequences. Here again the result of what appears to be but an ill-conceived attempt at epic variety of effect, has been to complicate and confuse. Every critical reader must be sensible, how much better the narrative would stand, if the passage from ἐπειδὴ Πανσωνίας, to ἀρχῆς (§ 128.), were omitted, and the story allowed to open with the traitor king's Byzantine intrigues, and pursue its natural course from its commencement to its catastrophe.

¹ i. 89—97.

APPENDIX G. (Pages 148, 158. sqq.)

ON THE RHETORICAL STYLE OF THUCYDIDES.

THESE illustrations of our remarks on the rhetorical portions of the Historian's work, have, with the twofold object of distinctness and conciseness, been embodied as sections of a single Appendix, rather than as separate notes. Each head of illustration has accordingly been referred to in the text, under its own proper section and number.

No. I. (to page 148.)

The following examples have been limited to cases where the correspondence referred to, is not merely in the form or sound, but even more in the sentiment of the parallel passages. Numerous examples of the former kind will be found in the ensuing heads of this Appendix.

The Corcyræan (Dorian) envoys to Athens, accuse the Corinthians, of being "more desirous to settle disputes by force of arms than by equitable arrangement." Pericles brings the same charge against the Lacedæmonians, and in terms almost identical :

I. 34. (Coreyr.) πολέμῳ μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ ἴσῳ ἐβουλήθησαν τὰ ἐγκλήματα μετελθεῖν.

I. 140. (Peric.) βούλονται δὲ πολέμῳ μᾶλλον ἢ λόγοις τὰ ἐγκλήματα διαλύεσθαι.

In the Lacedæmonian council, Archidamus, advocating a peaceful policy towards Athens, refers to her past services in defence of Greek liberty. The ephor Sthenelaidas replies, "that the Athenians, having once shown themselves capable of better things, deserve on this very account double punishment for the perversity of their present conduct."

A similar appeal by the Platæan captives to their former efforts in the same cause, is met by their Theban accusers with the same retort, partly in the same words :

I. 86. (Sthenel.) διπλάσις ζημίας ἄξιοί εἰσιν, ὅτι ἀντ' ἀγαθῶν κακοὶ γεγένηται.

III. 67. (Theb.) . . . τοῖς δὲ αἰσχρόν τι δρῶσι διπλάσις ζημίας, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ προσηκόντων ἀμαρτάνουσιν.

The Athenian envoys to Sparta remind the Lacedæmonians of

their having, towards the close of the Persian war, withdrawn from the federal force, and left the national defence in the hands of the Athenians. A Mytilenæan orator on a subsequent occasion, reminds them of the same fact in substantially the same terms :

I. 75. (Athen.) ὅμων μὲν οὐκ ἐβελησάντων παραμεῖναι πρὸς τὰ ὑπόλοιπα τοῦ βαρβάρου.

III. 10. (Mytil.) ἀπολιπόντων μὲν ὅμων ἐκ τοῦ Μηδικοῦ πολέμου, παραμεινάντων δ' ἐκείνων πρὸς τὰ ὑπόλοιπα τῶν ἔργων.

Archidamus, in alluding to the influence of the Spartan laws on the character of the citizens, employs one of the most idiomatic phrases in the Thucydidean vocabulary :

I. 84. ἀμαθέστερον τῶν νόμων τῆς ὑπεροψίας παιδευόμενοι.

Had this phrase been limited to one or two Laconian or Dorian orators, it might have been assumed to be a Laconian or Dorian idiom. It occurs however also in the mouth of the Attic demagogue Cleon :

III. 37. . . . ἀμαθέστεροι μὲν τῶν νόμων ἀξιοῦσιν εἶναι.

Another equally idiomatic specimen of Thucydidean Atticism is the phrase *διανοεῖσθαι*, to intend or design, in an absolute sense, the thing designed or intended not being expressed. It occurs twice ; once in the opening passage of the Historian's narrative ; once in the mouth of a Corinthian orator.

I. 1. (Thucyd.) τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν . . . συνιστάμενον . . . τὸ μὲν εὐθὺς, τὸ δὲ διανοούμενον.

124. (Corinth.) τῶν μὲν ἤδη ἄρχειν, τῶν δὲ διανοεῖσθαι.

The subjoined political dogma could hardly have been common to orations of Cleon and Alcibiades, unless in so far as placed in the mouth of each by Thucydides :

III. 37. (Cleon.) χεῖροσι νόμοις ἀκινήτοις χρωμένη πόλις, κρείσσων ἐστὶν ἢ καλῶς ἔχουσιν ἀκύροις.

VI. 18. (Alcib.) ἀσφαλέστατα τούτους οἰκεῖν, οἳ ἂν τοῖς παροῦσιν ἦθῃσι καὶ νόμοις, ἣν καὶ χεῖρω ἢ, ἥκιστα διαφόρως πολιτεύωσι.

Pericles to the Athenians, II. 38. ἡ τέρψις τὸ λυπηρὸν ἐκπλήσσει.

Brasidas to his troops, II. 87. φόβος γὰρ μνήμην ἐκπλήσσει.

Archidamus, I. 84. αἰδῶς σωφροσύνης πλεῖστον μετέχει.

Thucydides, III. 83. τὸ εὐθὺς, οὗ τὸ γενναῖον πλεῖστον μετέχει.

No. II. (to page 158.)

Nearly the whole rhetorical element of the Historian's work being an exemplification of this attribute of his style, it will not be necessary here to quote individual passages; the less, as numbers are cited in the sequel, in illustration of other kindred points of peculiarity. See especially No. VIII. below.

No. III. (to page 159.)

This pervading feature of the Historian's rhetorical style, has also been so largely illustrated in the subsequent numbers (IV. VII. X.), as scarcely to need further exemplification. See also Thucyd. III. 42. 45., IV. 17. sqq. 59. 62.

No. IV. (to page 159.)

In a council of Dorian states, the Corinthian deputies remark¹ that :

"It is the part of wise men, unless unjustly treated, to preserve peace; of valiant men, when unjustly treated, to prefer war to peace; but still to be ready to accept honourable terms of accommodation, being neither unduly elated by success in war, nor willing from a love of peace to submit to injury."

This series of very sensible precepts belong to the class of what are commonly called truisms, which it were as unreasonable to dispute, as superfluous to enforce by specific reasons. They are however made the subject of an elaborate justification, in another series of equally undeniable commonplaces.

"For he who remains inactive for the sake of peaceful enjoyment, runs risk of being speedily deprived of that pleasurable ease for the sake of which he remains inactive; while he who presumes too much on his success in war, does not reflect, that the boldness with which he is inspired is fallacious; for many ill-devised projects have succeeded, owing to a still greater want of judgment in the adversary; and many apparently well-projected schemes have come to a disastrous issue."

Diodotus, in his speech on behalf of the Mitylenæans, observes that: "Two of the chief obstacles to sage counsel are, haste and passion." A more palpable doctrine than this can hardly be imagined. It is not however allowed to pass without its due

¹ I. 20.

allowance of no less palpable demonstration : "haste being apt to be unwise, and passion to be indiscreet and precipitate."¹

In the sequel the same orator remarks that : "He is an unreasonable man, who denies that words are the expositors of deeds." Undeniable however as the fact is, it is not the less followed up by an equally self-evident illustration : "unreasonable if he supposes it possible, by any other means than words, to discuss what belongs to the future and is not yet manifest."²

No. V. (to page 159.)

These are in great part common grammatical figures of the Greek language, especially of the Attic dialect. They have however been employed by Thucydides to an excess, and with a peculiar subtlety of method, unexampled in any other writer, and which entitles them to rank as proper Thucydidean idioms.³ There can therefore be no better evidence of want of authenticity in his speeches, than the promiscuous manner in which he has placed, what are really forms of expression peculiar to himself, in the mouths of Dorian, Ionian, and Æolian orators. Of the few examples here cited in illustration of this licence, scarcely one is translatable into plain English, unless at the cost of a lengthened circumlocution ; and several are among the most perplexing of

¹ III. 42. νομίζω δὲ, δύο τὰ ἐναντιώτατα τῇ εὐβουλίᾳ εἶναι τάχος τε καὶ ὀργήν· ὧν τὸ μὲν μετ' ἀνοίας φιλεῖ γίγνεσθαι, τὸ δὲ μετ' ἀπαίδευσιος καὶ βραχύτητος γνώμης.

Arnold, we think, both misinterprets, and (as he is apt to do) exaggerates, the sense of the phrase ἀπαίδευσις, here interpreted Indiscretion, in defining it to denote the "coarseness and moral ignorance" of a "low and vulgar mind." By reference to the only other parallel passage of Thucydides, and to many of Xenophon, it seems nearly equivalent to ἀμαθία : want of mature judgment and discretion. "A low and vulgar mind" is more apt to be cunningly cautious than hasty.

² τοὺς δὲ λόγους ὅστις διαμάχεται μὴ διδασκάλους τῶν πραγμάτων γίγνεσθαι, . . . ἀξένιος ἐστιν. . . ἀξένιος μὲν, εἰ ἄλλῃ τινὶ ἡγείται περὶ τοῦ μίλλοντος δυνατὸν εἶναι, καὶ μὴ ἐμφανούς, φράσαι. . .

³ In the passage for example commencing : δυνατώτατα γὰρ ταῦτα τῶν ναυτικῶν. . . (I. 14.) τὰ ναυτικά is a familiar Greek phrase for navy, fleet, naval power. But the exaggerated mode of its application, with the kindred series of anomalous usage to which it gives the tone, renders it here a Thucydidean peculiarity.

those logical conundrums, with which Thucydides loves to bewilder the brains of his readers.

- I. 36. (Coreyr.) γνώτω, τὸ μὲν δεδιὸς αὐτοῦ ἰσχὺν ἔχον, τοὺς ἐναντίους μᾶλλον φοβήσονται· τὸ δὲ θαρσοῦν μὴ δεξαμένον, ἀσθενὲς ὃν πρὸς ἰσχύοντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς, ἀδεέστερον ἐσόμενον . . .
- II. 44. (Pericles.) τὸ γὰρ φιλότιμον ἀγῆρων μόνον·¹ καὶ οὐκ ἐν τῷ ἀχρεΐῳ τῆς ἡλικίας τὸ κερδαίνειν . . . μᾶλλον τέρπει, ἀλλὰ τὸ τιμᾶσθαι.
87. (Brasid.) πρὸς μὲν οὖν τὸ ἐμπερότερον αὐτῶν τὸ τολμηρότερον ἀντιτάξασθε, πρὸς δὲ τὸ διὰ τὴν ἥσσαν δεδιέναι, τὸ ἀπαράσκενοι τότε τυχεῖν.
- III. 11. (Mytilen.) πρὸς τὸ πλεῖον ἤδη εἶκον, τοῦ ἡμετέρου ἔτι μόνον ἀντισουμένον.
56. (Platæana.) εἰ γὰρ τῷ αὐτίκα χρησίῃς ὑμῶν γε, καὶ τῷ ἐκείνων πολεμίῳ, τὸ δίκαιον λήψεσθε, τοῦ μὲν ὀρθοῦ φανεῖσθε οὐκ ἀληθεῖς κριταὶ ὄντες, τὸ δὲ ξυμφέρον μᾶλλον θεραπεύοντες.

Under this head may also be noticed a certain vague and indefinite use of the demonstrative pronoun, especially of αὐτός, ἡ, ὁ, in neuter, and commonly plural form, with reference to an antecedent or antecedents, either altogether problematical, or so little apparent, as to require an effort to discover which or what they are. The examples of this anomaly are little less frequent in the Historian's own narrative, especially its discursive passages, than in the speeches of his orators. A remarkable one presents itself in the first section of the work: τὰ γὰρ πρὸ αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ ἔτι παλαιώτερα . . . literally, "those before these, and those still more ancient." This is one of the passages above defined, the meaning of which is clear, but the structure difficult to explain. What Thucydides refers to is the great obscurity of the history of Greece prior to the Peloponnesian war. But whether the indefinite terms of his reference are to be rendered: "those" or "these" times, "political vicissitudes" or "things in general," is a question to be

¹ This is one of those passages where the grammatical structure is clear, but the sense difficult to discover. A literal version would be: "the love of honour is alone exempt from old age," which is unmeaning. If it be meant, as would appear from the sequel, parabolically to imply, that "love of honour is the only passion which in old age retains its hold upon men," the maxim is palpably untrue.

solved according to the taste or fancy of different readers. In the sequel, § 11., the same indefinite demonstratives recur, in slightly varied form: τὰ πρὸ τούτων . . . καὶ αὐτὰ γε· where however the general application to the previous times, events, or circumstances, if not so obvious as to bring the construction within the limits of ordinary classical usage, is at least, as in some other parallel cases (I. 121. 144., VI. 10., alibi), more easy to apprehend. Other examples of the more vague or enigmatical kind, are: I. 122. βεβαί-
οῦμεν αὐτό· V. 27. initio, 86.¹ two exx.; VI. 18. 87. In not a few instances, I. 32. 68. 138., IV. 18., besides some of those above quoted, αὐτό is used where other Attic writers would have used τοῦτο.

No. VI. (to page 159.)

Among the more characteristic forms in which this figure, combined with that illustrated in the previous number, displays itself, is the specification of a particular mental affection or operation, as a separate part or element of the mind; as in the following examples:

- I. 90. τὸ βουλόμενον καὶ ὑποκτον² τῆς γνώμης; "the designing, and suspecting part, or state, of their minds;" for "their designs and suspicions."
- VII. 68. τῆς γνώμης τὸ θυμούμενον; "their indignation."
- V. 9. ἐν τῷ ἀνειμένῳ αὐτῶν τῆς γνώμης; "in their indecision or vacillation."
- II. 87. τῆς γνώμης τὸ μὴ κατὰ κράτος νικηθέν: "the part of the mind which has not yielded to force;" for unsubdued resolution.

¹ One of the acutest native Greek grammarians admits himself to have been puzzled by this passage. He has hence been severely taken to task for his stupidity by Poppo; whose commentary on the Historian's style, is in great part an elaborate effort to prove that the obscurities and anomalies, of which his other critics, antient and modern, complain, exist but in the imagination of those not qualified, like Poppo, to comprehend him. The explanation of the first αὐτοῦ of this series, as given by Poppo (Proleg. p. 101.), and Arnold ad loc., is probably correct; but that by Arnold of the second, we hold to be wrong, or at least extremely doubtful. The word appears to connect itself more naturally (if such a term be here admissible) with the κριτὰς ἔκοντας ὑμᾶς of the immediately preceding sentence.

² Conf. VI. 85. ἐπὶ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ὑπόπτῳ; 89. τῷ ὑπόπτῳ μου.

- II. 59. τὸ ὀργιζόμενον τῆς γνώμης; irritation.
 61. ἐν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἀσθενεῖ τῆς γνώμης.
 III. 10. ἐν τῷ διαλλάσσουντι τῆς γνώμης.
 I. 142. ἐν τῷ μὴ μελετῶντι, neglect or indifference.

Similar is the definition :

- II. 63. τῆς πόλεως . . . τῷ τιμωμένῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχεῖν; the imperial honour of the state.

In the subjoined example, by another variety of abstract definition, the Inactive, τὸ ἀπραγμον, signifies, not inaction, but a sluggish or inactive man or body of men; the Active, or energetic, τὸ δραστήριον, denotes, in like manner, not action or energy, but active or energetic people:

- II. 63. τὸ ἀπραγμον οὐ σώζεται, μὴ μετὰ τοῦ δραστηρίου τεταγμένον.

Similar are the expressions τὸ Ἑλληνικόν¹, for the Hellenes; τὸ ἑταιρικόν²; τὸ ἐπικουρικόν.³

To this head also belong the phrases, τὰ τῶν πόλεων⁴, the states or cities; τὰ τοῦ πολέμου⁵, the war; τὰ τῆς ὀργῆς ὑμῶν⁶, your displeasure.

No. VII. (to page 159.)

Under this head may be classed a method, altogether peculiar to Thucydides, of personifying mental qualities, affections, and passions, as independent agents, acting, and influencing each other, free from any control on the part of the human beings whose interests are concerned, and who thus appear as mere passive machines under their guidance:

- II. 62. (Pericles.) Prudence renders the boldness inspired by equality of fortune firmer, by the aid of self-confidence; and places less reliance on Hope, whose strength lies in cases of difficulty, than on Judgment guided by existing circumstances, whose foresight is more to be trusted.⁷

¹ I. 1.

² VIII. 43., III. 82.

³ IV. 52.

⁴ III. 82.

⁵ V. 86.

⁶ II. 60. conf. Porpo ad loc.

⁷ τὴν τόλμαν ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμοίας τύχης, ἢ ξένεισις ἐκ τοῦ ὑπέρφρονος ἰχυρω-

- III. 14. (Mytil.) Men such as our fear wishes them to be.¹
 45. (Cleon.) Poverty, bringing Audacity to the aid of Necessity, and Power, uniting Avarice to Insolence and Arrogance, with the other affections to which the will of man is subject, acting on its morbid incapacity to resist such influences, seduce into hazardous enterprises; while Hope and Desire, everywhere present, the one leading the other following, the one conceiving the design, the other suggesting the facility of success, are the most injurious of all, and being invisible are more dangerous than other, visible evils.²
- V. 103. (Athen.) Hope, encouraging to dangerous enterprises, although she may injure, does not ruin those whose trust in her is backed by abundant resources. But while those who place their whole fortunes at her mercy, for she is spendthrift by nature, discover her, to their cost, to be deceitful, she does not abandon her hold even of such as from experience are on their guard against her.³

In the following passage, had Thucydides described "the minds of men who have lately suffered defeat as less bold in again "facing the same danger," his language would have been within the limits of familiar usage. But the case, as he shapes it, illustrates, perhaps still more pointedly than the preceding examples, this quaint kind of *prosopopœia*:

τίραν παρέχεται ἱλπίδι τε ἥσσαν πιστεύει, ἥς ἐν τῷ ἀπόρῳ ἡ ἰσχύς, γνώμη δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, ἥς βεβαιωτέρα ἡ πρόνοια.

¹ *ἄνδρες οἴουσπερ . . . τὸ ἡμέτερον δῖος βούλειται.*

² *ἡ μὲν πένια ἀνάγκη τὴν τόλμαν παρέχουσα, ἡ δ' ἐξουσία ὕβρει τὴν πλεονεξίαν καὶ φρονήματι, αἱ δὲ ἄλλαι ξινηυχίαι ὀργῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὥς ἐκάστη τις κατίζεται ὑπ' ἀνηκίστου τινὸς κρείσσονος, ἐξάγουσιν ἐς κινδύνους· ἡ τε ἱλπίς, καὶ ὁ ἔρως ἐπὶ παντὶ, ὁ μὲν ἡγούμενος ἡ δ' ἐφεπομένη, καὶ ὁ μὲν τὴν ἐπιβολὴν ἐφροντίζων, ἡ δὲ τὴν εὐπορίαν τῆς τύχης ὑποτιθεῖσα, πλείστα βλάπτουσιν· καὶ ὄντα ἀφανῆ, κρείσσων ἐστὶ τῶν ὀρωμένων δεινῶν.*

³ *ἱλπίς δὲ κινδύνῳ παραμύθιον οὖσα, τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ περιουσίας χρωμένους αὐτῇ, κἂν βλάβῃ οὐ καθέλειν· τοῖς δ' ἐς ἅπαν τὸ ὑπάρχον ἀναβρίπτουσι, δάπανος γὰρ φύσει, ἅμα τε γινώσκειται σφαλίντων, καὶ ἐν ὕψι ἐτι φυλάσσεται τις αὐτὴν γνωρισθεῖσα, οὐκ ἑλλείπει.*

- II. 89. (Phormio). The minds of men who have suffered defeat, are not willing to be equally bold in facing the same danger.¹

In IV. 62., by a peculiarly wide stretch of the same figure, Vengeance has been personified as the party injured, and seeking revenge :

(Hermocr.) *τιμωρία γὰρ οὐκ εὐτυχεῖ δικαίως, ὅτι καὶ ἀδικεῖται.*

No. VIII. (to page 160.)

A characteristic, and perhaps the most elegant example of this uniformity of cadence, and of the Historian's antithetical style generally, is the series of sophistries by which Alcibiades, in his address to the Lacedæmonian council, attempts to justify his treason to his own country :²

"I am a defaulter from the malice of my persecutors : but not, if you are willing to trust me, from your interests. For the enmity of men who, like you, make war upon their enemies, is not worse than that of men who force their friends to become their enemies. Neither do I connect my feeling as a citizen with the injustice which I have suffered : but with the undisturbed enjoyment of my right of citizenship. Nor do I consider myself as now warring against a country which I still possess : but rather as striving to regain possession of a country no longer mine. For the truly patriotic man is not he who, when unjustly deprived of his country, abstains from acting against it : but he who adopts every possible means of gratifying his desire to recover it."

This speech of Alcibiades is, it may be remarked, the most fluent, and, in the literal sense of the term, readable, of the longer orations ; being almost entirely free from the knottiness of structure, and enigmatical compression, so prevalent in the others.

With the above passage may be compared another of the more subtle sententious order, quoted in the subsequent text (p. 175.), where the Historian in his own person describes the virulence of party feeling among the Greek states.

¹ ἡσσημένων ἀνδρῶν οὐκ ἰθείλουσι αἱ γνώμαι πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοὺς κινδύνους ἁμῖται εἶναι. CONF. II. 87.

² VI. 92.

No. IX. (to page 160.)

The examples of these rhetorical graces, here selected from the copious stock which the entire text supplies, will also tend to elucidate other idiomatic peculiarities adverted to in the previous sections :

- I. 23. (Thucyd.) τὰ πρότερον ἀκοῇ μὲν λεγόμενα, ἔργῳ δὲ σπανιώτερον βεβαιούμενα. . . .
- III. 82. (Thucyd.) τῷ μὲν αἰσχύνονται, ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ἀγάλλονται.
 „ (Thucyd.) τὸ πρὸς ἅπαν ξυνετὸν, ἐπὶ πᾶν ἀργόν.
- VI. 69. (Thucyd.) τὸ μὲν αὐτίκα σωτηρίας, τὸ δὲ μέλλον ἐλευθερίας.
- I. 37. (Corinthians.) τὴν ἀρετὴν διδοῦσι, καὶ δεχομένοις, τὰ δίκαια δεικνύναι.
 „ (Corinthians.) οὐχ ἵνα μὴ συναδικήσωσι . . . ἀλλ' ὅπως κατὰ μόνας ἀδικήσωσι· καὶ ὅπως ἐν ᾧ μὲν κρατῶσι βιάζονται, οὗ δ' ἂν λάθωσι πλέον ἔχωσιν, ἣν δὲ πού τι προσλάβωσιν, ἀναισχυντῶσι.
68. (Corinthians.) ὅπο μὲν Ἀθηναίων ὑβριζόμενοι, ὑπὸ δ' ἑμῶν ἀμελούμενοι.
69. (Corinthians.) αἰτία μὲν γὰρ φίλων ἀνδρῶν ἐστὶν ἀμαρτανόντων, κατηγορία δὲ ἐχθρῶν ἀδικησάντων.
70. (Corinthians.) καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν τολμηταί, καὶ παρὰ γνώμην κινδυνευταί.
77. (Athenians.) βιάζεσθαι γὰρ οἷς ἂν ἐξῇ, δικάζεσθαι οὐδὲν προσδέονται.
- III. 38. (Cleon.) Θεαταὶ μὲν τῶν λόγων, . . . ἀκροαταὶ δὲ τῶν ἔργων.
 „ (Cleon.) δοῦλοι ὄντες τῶν αἰεὶ ἀτόπων, ὑπερόπται δὲ τῶν εἰωθόντων.¹
 „ (Cleon.) καὶ προαισθέσθαι τε πρόθυμοι εἶναι τὰ λεγόμενα, καὶ προνοῆσαι βραδεῖς τὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποξυσόμενα.
- II. 87. (Brasidas.) πρὸς μὲν οὖν τὸ ἐμπειρότερον αὐτῶν, τὸ τολμηρότερον ἀντιτάξασθε.

¹ This example seems to throw light on the expedients resorted to by Thucydides in working up such passages. The idea, in the first limb of the antithesis, is complete in the four words: δοῦλοι ὄντες τῶν ἀτόπων. The αἰεὶ does not improve the sense; rather the reverse. But it adds to the symmetry of form and cadence, for which purpose it has evidently been thrown in.

- II. 89. (Phormio.) τῷ δὲ ἐκάτεροί τι ἐμπειρότεροι εἶναι, θρασύτεροί
ἔσμεν.
III. 65. (Thebans.) τῶν σωμάτων τὴν πόλιν οὐκ ἀλλοτριοῦντες,
ἀλλ' ἐς τὴν συγγένειαν οἰκειοῦντες.
IV. 20. (Lacedæm.) χαρισαμένοις τε μᾶλλον, ἢ βιασαμένοις.
VII. 13. (Nicias.) οἰόμενοι χρηματιεῖσθαι, μᾶλλον ἢ μαχεῖσθαι.

In the following passages, the antithetical quibble of sense and sound amounts to a sort of pun or play of words:

- I. 33. (Coreytræans.) προεπιβουλεύειν αὐτοῖς, μᾶλλον ἢ ἀντεπιβου-
λεύειν.
38. (Corinthians.) ἀποικοὶ δ' ὄντες, ἀφεστᾶσί τε διὰ παντός.
39. (Corinthians.) ἀξιοῦντες οὐ ξυμμαχεῖν ἀλλὰ ξυναδικεῖν.
II. 40. (Pericles.) φιλοκαλοῦμεν γὰρ μετ' εὐτελείας, καὶ φιλο-
σοφοῦμεν ἀνευ μαλακίας.
62. (Pericles.) μὴ φρονήματι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταφρονήματι.
III. 39. (Cleon.) ἐπανεστήσαν μᾶλλον ἢ ἀπέστησαν.
IV. 14. (Thucyd.) οἳ τε γὰρ Λακεδαιμόνιοι . . . ἐκ γῆς ἐνανυμά-
χουν, οἳ τε Ἀθηναῖοι . . . ἀπὸ νεῶν ἐπε-
ζομάχουν.
62. (Hermocr.) εὐπρεπῶς ἄδικοι ἐλθόντες, εὐλόγως ἀπρακτοὶ
ἀπίασιν.
" (Hermocr.) μὴ τοὺς ἐμούς λόγους ὑπεριδεῖν, τὴν δὲ αὐτοῦ
τινὰ σωτηρίαν μᾶλλον ἀπ' αὐτῶν προιδεῖν.
VI. 76. (Hermocr.) οὐκ ἀξυνεγωτέρου, κακοξυνεγωτέρου δέ . . .
" (Hermocr.) οὐ Λεοντίνους βούλεσθαι κατοικῆσαι, ἀλλ' ἡμᾶς
μᾶλλον ἐξοικῆσαι.
VII. 68. (Gylippus.) καὶ νομίσωμεν ἅμα μὲν νομιμώτατον εἶναι.

Of the etymological pun there are but two clear examples in Thucydides, and those not greatly to his credit, either as a linguist or a man of sense. It may seem strange that he could have supposed the term αἰδῖος, perpetual, eternal, to be compounded of ἴδιος, proper, peculiar, and α privative. Yet the subjoined passages leave no doubt of the fact:

- IV. 20. (Lacedæm.) ἐν ᾧ ἀνάγκη αἰδῖον ὑμῖν ἔχθραν πρὸς τῇ κοινῇ
καὶ ἰδίαν ἔχειν.
63. (Hermocr.) μάλιστα μὲν ἐς αἰδῖον ξυμβῶμεν· εἰ δὲ μὴ, χρό-
νον ὥς πλείστον σπείσάμενοι, τὰς ἰδίας δια-
ὰς ἐς αὐθις ἀναβαλώμεθα.

IV. 87. (Brasidas.) . . . καὶ αἰδίων δόξαν καταθέσθαι, καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ
τε ἴδια μὴ βλαφθῆναι . . .

The distinction in his subtle mind may have lain, between the idea of perpetuity, and that of limited duration; the latter as necessarily attaching to all mere private or personal interest in the affairs of life.

In the other example, if the etymology itself is not quite so grievously at fault, the illustrative commentary does not tend to improve its aptitude:

I. 122. τὴν πλείστον βλάβασαν καταφρόνησιν, . . . ἢ ἐκ τοῦ πολλοῦ
σφάλλειν, τὸ ἐνάντιον ὄνομα ἀφροσύνη μετωνόμασται.

No. X. (to page 160.)

The most striking exemplification of this Rhetorical commonplace, is supplied by the passages in which the Historian impresses on his readers, in his favourite antithetical mode, the difference material, moral, and metaphysical, between Words and Deeds¹, and the superior value of the latter in the business of life. His partiality for this trite dogma of popular ethics amounts to a sort of monomania; and the excess of tautology in which it displays itself, is one of the most remarkable phenomena of its kind in Greek classical composition. The passages in which the lesson is inculcated are nearly eighty in number. They assume however occasional varieties of form, corresponding to the several modifications of which, in every language, the fundamental idea is susceptible, such as Intention and execution², Expectation and fulfilment³, Profession and performance.⁴ The case is one which, like many others in literary criticism, can be clearly apprehended only by examples. The portion of the text where they chiefly abound, is the Funeral oration of Pericles, which contains about sixteen. The dogma inculcated forms in fact, as stated in the text above (p. 169.), the key note or "motivo" (to borrow an illustration from the art of music) of that entire oration.⁵ In some parts of it they are grouped together by threes and fours in nearly continuous sentences. Those bestowed on other speeches of Pericles make up as his share about a fourth of the whole. Those

¹ λόγοι καὶ ἔργα.

² ἐλπὶς καὶ ἔργον.

³ ὄνομα καὶ ἔργον.

² γνώμη καὶ ἔργον.

⁵ See below, p. 631.

where Thucydides speaks in his own person amount to twenty-three. We shall be content with quoting the Periclean and Thucydidean examples; subjoining a reference to the others, under the name of each orator in whose speech or speeches they occur. In each allotment a priority has been given, in the order of citation, to the more trite and familiar forms in which the fundamental idea is expressed.

PERICLES. FUNERAL ORATION.

- II. 35. οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ . . . ἐπαινοῦσι τὸν προσθέντα τῷ νόμῳ τὸν λόγον τόνδε . . . ἐμοὶ δὲ ἄρκοῦν ἂν ἐδόκει εἶναι, ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργῳ γενομένων, ἔργῳ καὶ δηλοῦσθαι τὰς τιμὰς.
40. πλούτῳ τε ἔργου μᾶλλον καιρῷ, ἢ λόγου κόμπῳ χρώμεθα.¹
- „ οὐ τοὺς λόγους τοῖς ἔργοις βλάβην ἡγούμενοι.
- „ μὴ προδίδαχθῆναι μᾶλλον λόγῳ, πρότερον ἢ ἐπὶ ᾧ δεῖ ἔργῳ ἐλθεῖν.
41. οὐ λόγον ἐν τῷ παρόντι κόμπος τάδε, μᾶλλον ἢ ἔργων ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια.
42. ἰσοῤῥόπος . . . ὁ λόγος τῶν ἔργων φανείη.
- „ τὸ μὲν αἰσχρὸν τοῦ λόγου ἔφυγον, τὸ δ' ἔργον τῷ σώματι ὑπέμειναν.
43. σκῦντας μὴ λόγῳ μόνον τὴν ὥφελίαν . . . ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον . . . ἔργῳ θεωμένους.
- „ ἡ δόξα . . . αἰεὶ καὶ λόγου καὶ ἔργου καιρῷ ἀείμνηστος καταλείπεται.
46. εἴρηται καὶ ἐμοὶ λόγῳ . . . καὶ ἔργῳ οἱ θαπτόμενοι . . . κεκόσμηται.
40. τὸ πένεσθαι οὐχ ὁμολογεῖν τινι αἰσχρὸν, ἀλλὰ μὴ διαφεύγειν ἔργῳ αἴσχιον.
41. ἔπεσι μὲν τὸ αὐτίκα τέρψει, τῶν δ' ἔργων τὴν ὑπόνοιαν ἡ ἀλήθεια βλάβει.
42. ἐλπιδὶ μὲν τὸ ἀφανὲς . . . ἐπιτρέψαντες, ἔργῳ δὲ . . . σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἀξιούντες πεποιθέναι.
43. γιγνώσκοντες τὰ δέοντα, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις αἰσχυρόμενοι . . .
- „ ἄγραφος μνήμη παρ' ἐκάστῳ τῆς γνώμης μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ ἔργου ἐνδιδαιτᾷται.
39. πιστεύοντες οὐ ταῖς παρασκευαῖς τὸ πλεόν καὶ ἀπάταις . . . ἢ τῷ . . . ἐς τὰ ἔργα εὐψύχῳ.

¹ This example, and those below in §§ 41. 43., possesses other common elements of antithetical commonplace, in the terms *καιρός* and *κόμπος*.

PERICLES.] [OTHER SPEECHES.

- I. 144. ἐκεῖνα μὲν καὶ ἐν ἄλλῃ λόγῳ ἅμα τοῖς ἔργοις δηλωθήσεται.
 140. οὐ τῇ αὐτῇ ὀργῇ ἀνακειθόμενους . . . καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ πράσσοντας.
 II. 64. γνώμῃ μὲν ἥκιστα λυποῦνται, ἔργῳ δὲ μάλιστα ἀντέχουσι.

THUCYDIDES.

- I. 128. τῷ μὲν λόγῳ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν πόλεμον, τῷ δὲ ἔργῳ τὰ πρὸς βασιλεία πράγματα πράσσων.
 II. 8. καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ ξυνεπιλαμβάνειν.
 65. λόγῳ μὲν δημοκρατία, ἔργῳ δὲ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή.
 III. 70. τῷ μὲν λόγῳ . . . διηγνημένοι, ἔργῳ δὲ πεπεισμένοι.
 83. τῷ γὰρ δεδιέναι . . . μὴ λόγοις τε ἥσσους ὦσι . . . τολμηρῶς πρὸς τὰ ἔργα ἐχώρου.
 IV. 67. ἐπειδὴ ἀπὸ τε τῶν ἔργων καὶ τῶν λόγων παρεσκεύαστο ἀμφοτέροις.
 70. τῷ λόγῳ, καὶ ἅμα εἰ δύναιτο ἔργῳ, τῆς Νισαίας περᾶσαι.
 V. 55. οὐκ ἔφη τοὺς λόγους τοῖς ἔργοις ὁμολογεῖν.
 69. εἰδότες ἔργων ἐκ πολλοῦ μελέτην πλείω σώζουσιν, ἢ λόγων δι' ὀλίγου καλῶς ῥηθεῖσαν παραίνεσιν.
 VI. 88. . . ὑπουργεῖν μὲν τοῖς Συρακουσίοις μᾶλλον ἔργῳ . . . ἐν δὲ τῷ παρόντι . . . λόγῳ ἀποκρίνασθαι.
 VII. 48. τῷ μὲν ἔργῳ ἔτι . . . ἀνείχεν, τῷ δ' ἐμφανεῖ τότε λόγῳ οὐκ ἔφη ἀπάξειν . . .
 69. πάντα τε ἔργῳ ἔτι . . . ἐνδεᾶ εἶναι, καὶ λόγῳ . . . ἱκανὰ εἰρησθαι.
 VIII. 46. τὸν λόγον τε ξυμφορώτατον, καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἔχοντας πολέμεϊν.
 92. πολλῶν . . . λόγων . . . προσγενομένων, καὶ ἔργῳ ἤδη ἥπτοντο τῶν πραγμάτων.
 I. 11. δηλοῦται τοῖς ἔργοις ὑποδεέστερα ὄντα τῆς φήμης, καὶ τοῦ . . . λόγου.
 130. ἔργοις βραχέσι προσηλόν, ἃ τῇ γνώμῃ . . . ἐμελλε πράξειν.
 III. 83. ἔργῳ οὐδὲν σφᾶς δεῖν λαμβάνειν ἃ γνώμῃ ἔξεστιν.
 I. 23. τὰ πρότερον ἀκοῇ μὲν λεγόμενα, ἔργῳ δὲ σπανιώτερον βεβαιούμενα.
 IV. 81. τῶν μὲν πείρα αἰσθημένων, τῶν δὲ ἀκοῇ νομισάντων.
 82. τό τε πρῶτον . . . ἐπενύει, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ ἔταξεν.
 III. 82. τὴν εἰωθυῖαν ἀξίωσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐς τὰ ἔργα ἀντήλλαξαν . . .

viii. 78. ἄλλως ὄνομα καὶ οὐκ ἔργον.

89. ἔργον καὶ μὴ ὀνόματι.

Hermocrates (Syracusan): vi. 78, 79. 78. 80. 86. 83.

Brasidas (Spartan): iv. 87. 85. 126., v. 9.

Archidamus (Spartan): i. 84. two exx., ii. 11. two exx.

Athenagoras (Syracusan): vi. 38. 40. two exx.

Alcibiades: vi. 17, 18. 86.

Cleon: iii. 38. two exx.

Corinthian orators: i. 39. 68, 69. 120. two exx., 70. two exx.

Athenians: i. 78. 78., v. 111.

Thebans: iii. 66, 67. two exx.

Mytilenæans: iii. 10.

Another favourite antithetical commonplace of the Historian and his orators, is a similar contrast between the correlative ideas, Public or common (δημόσιον, κοινόν), and Private or peculiar (ἴδιον), in property, feeling, or interest in the affairs of life. Here too the larger proportion of examples are found in the Funeral address of Pericles, that standard repertory of the more prominent characteristics of Thucydidean rhetoric. The four which it comprises will here suffice for illustration:

ii. 37. ἀνεπαχθῶς τὰ ἴδια προσομιλοῦντες, τὰ δημόσια . . . οὐ παρανομοῦμεν.

42. κοινῶς μᾶλλον ὠφέλησαν, ἢ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἔβλαψαν.

43. κοινῇ γὰρ τὰ σώματα διδόντες, ἰδίᾳ τὸν ἀγέρων ἔπαινον ἐλάμβανον.

61. ἀπαλγῆσαντες δὲ τὰ ἴδια, τοῦ κοινοῦ τῆς σωτηρίας ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι.

Conf. i. 80. (two exx.) 90. 120. 128., ii. 13. 65., iii. 14. 45., iv. 121., vi. 12.

Two other specimens are added of idiomatic phraseology, common to Thucydidean orators of all classes and countries:

i. 68. (Corinth.) . . . ὥς οὐκ εἰδόσι . . . τί δεῖ μακρηγορεῖν;

ii. 36. (Pericles.) μακρηγορεῖν ἐν εἰδόσιν οὐ βουλόμενος.

48. (Pericles.) τὴν ὠφέλιαν, ἣν ἂν τις πρὸς . . . ἡμᾶς εἰδότας μηκύνει.

iv. 59. (Hermocr.) τί ἂν τις . . . ἐν εἰδόσι μακρηγοροῖ;

vi. 77. (Hermocr.) ἀποφανοῦντες ἐν εἰδόσιν ὅσα ἀδικεῖ.

iii. 53. (Platæans.) πρὸς εἰδότας πάντα λελέξεται.

- iv. 17. (Lacedæm.) . . . πρὸς εἰδότας ἡγησάμενοι.
 v. 89. (Athen.) διαπράσσεσθαι ἐπισταμένους πρὸς εἰδότας.
 ii. 65. (Thucyd.) κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας διαφορὰς περιπεσόντες.
 i. 68. (Corinth.) ἔνεκα τῶν αὐτοῖς ἰδίᾳ διαφορῶν λέγουσι.
 ii. 37. (Pericles.) πρὸς τὰ ἴδια διάφορα πᾶσι τὸ ἴσον.
 v. 115. (Thucyd.) ἐπολέμησαν ἰδίων τινῶν διαφορῶν ἔνεκα τοῖς
 Ἀθηναίοις.
 iv. 63. (Hermocr.) τὰς ἰδίας διαφορὰς ἐσαῦθις ἀναβαλόμεθα.

It may be remarked generally, of those varied forms of the Historian's rhetorical idiom, that they are far more frequent in the earlier than the later parts of his work: the examples derivable from the first four books being probably, for we do not pretend to have made an exact calculation, in the ratio of 2 or 3 to 1, of those supplied by the remainder. It might appear as if more mature practice in composition, and the influence of his own strong common sense, had gradually taken off the edge of that more extreme subtlety of thought and expression, under the influence of which, whether imputable to his own natural taste, or to the lessons of Gorgias and Antiphon, he had commenced his undertaking.

No. XI. (to pages 8. 162, 163.)

We have here subjoined a few examples of such peculiarity of rhetorical expression, common to Antiphon with Thucydides, as can be recognised in the extant works of the former. The numbers under which the passages have been ranged, correspond in each case, to those of the previous text of this Appendix in which the parallel peculiarities of Thucydides have been exemplified. The coincidences are certainly striking, and go far to confirm the tradition as to the relation of master and disciple between the two authors:

(v.)

ἐν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ δίκαιψ, οὐχ ἥσσον ἢ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ.
 κρεῖσσον δὲ . . . τὸ ὑμέτερον δυνάμενον ἐμὲ δίκαιως σώζειν, ἢ τὸ τῶν
 ἐχθρῶν βουλόμενον ἀδίκως με ἀπολλύναι.
 οὔτε τὸ ὑμέτερον εὐσεβὲς παρεῖς.¹

¹ De Herod. cæde, § 7. 78. 96. ed. Bekk.

(VI. VII.)

ἢ τε αἰσχύνῃ μείζων οὔσα τῆς διαφορᾶς . . . ἄρκουσα ἦν σωφρονίσαι
τὸ θυμούμενον τῆς γνώμης.¹

(II. VIII.)

ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς καὶ προβουλῆς.

αὐτῆς μὲν τοῦτο εὗρημα, ἐκείνης δὲ ὑπέρηγμα.

ἢ μὲν γὰρ ἐκουσίως καὶ βουλευσάσα τὸν θάνατον, ὁ δὲ ἀκουσίως καὶ
βιαίως ἀπέθανε.

ἐλεεῖν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀκουσίοις παθήμασι, μᾶλλον προσήκει ἢ τοῖς ἐλου-
σίοις . . . ἀδικήμασι καὶ ἁμαρτήμασι.²

οὐ τὸν αἴτιον ἀφέντες, τὸν ἀναίτιον διώκομεν.³

οἱ δὲ διώκοντες μὲν ἐμὲ τὸν ἀναίτιον, τὸν δ' αἴτιον ἀφίεντες, τῆς τε
ἀφορίας αἵτιοι γίνονται.⁴

τὸ μὲν οὖν μειράκιον ἀναμάρτητον ὄν, οὐκ ἂν δικαίως ὑπὲρ τοῦ
ἁμαρτόντος κολάζεταιτο . . . ὁ δὲ παῖς ταῖς αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτίαις
διαφθαρεῖς, ἅμα ἡμαρτέ τε καὶ ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐκολάσθη.⁵

τοῦ μὲν πεκείραμαι πέρα τοῦ προσήκοντος, τοῦ δὲ ἐνδεῆς εἰμι μάλ-
λον τοῦ συμφέροντος.⁶

(X.)

ἔργῳ καὶ οὐ λόγῳ δοκεῖ μοι σημαίνειν.

παθὼν . . . ἔτι δεινότερα τούτων, ἔργῳ καὶ οὐ λόγῳ.

μὴ ἔργα φανερά ὑπὸ πονηρᾶς λόγων ἀκριβείας πεισθέντες.⁷

θέλω δὲ μὴ πρότερον ἐπ' ἄλλον λόγον ὀρμῆσαι, ἢ τὸ ἔργον ἔτι
φανερώτερον καταστήσαι.⁸

ἐπὶ τοῖς τῶν κατηγορῶν λόγοις εἶναι, μᾶλλον ἢ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς τοῖς
ἔργοις.⁹

οὐ γὰρ δίκαιον οὐτ' ἔργῳ ἁμαρτόντα διὰ ῥήματα σωθῆναι, οὐτ' ἔργῳ
ὀρθῶς πράξαντα διὰ ῥήματα ἀπολέσθαι. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ῥήμα
τῆς γλώττης ἀμάρτημά ἐστι, τὸ δ' ἔργον τῆς γνώμης.¹⁰

¹ Tetralog. I. iii. 3.

² Categor. Pharm. § 3. 15. 26, 27. Of the jingle between ἐκούσιος and ἀκούσιος, see other examples in Tetral. I. iii. 1., II. iv. 8.

³ Tetral. I. i. 2.

⁴ Tetral. I. ii. 11.

⁵ Tetral. II. iv. 8.

⁶ De Herodis cæde, § 1.

⁷ Tetral. II. iii. 1. 3.

⁸ Tetral. II. iv. 5.

⁹ De Herod. cæde, § 3.

¹⁰ De Herod. cæde, § 5. alibi. This figure of speech is popular generally with Attic orators, but nowhere to the same idiomatic excess as with Thucydides and Antiphon.

With these passages of Antiphon, and with the parallel texts of Thucydides, may be compared the following extracts from the scanty remains¹ of Gorgias; the other standard model on whom Thucydides is supposed to have formed his style:

Δεράποντες μὲν τῶν ἀδίκως δυστυχοῦντων, κολασαὶ δὲ τῶν ἀδίκως εὐτυχοῦντων.

τῇ φρονίμῃ τῆς γνώμης, παύοντες τὸ ἄφρον τῆς βώμης.

αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντων ὁ πόθος οὐ συναπέθανεν, ἀλλ' ἀθάνατος ἐν ἀσωμάτοις σώμασι ζῇ οὐ ζώντων.

χρήματα κτᾶσθαι μὲν ὡς χρῶτο, χρῆσθαι δὲ ὡς τιμῶτο.

ἦν ὁ τε ἀπατήσας δικαιότερος τοῦ μὴ ἀπατήσαντος· καὶ ὁ ἀπατηθεὶς σοφώτερος τοῦ μὴ ἀπατηθέντος.

τὸ μὲν εἶναι ἀφανές, μὴ τυχὸν τοῦ δοκεῖν, τὸ δὲ δοκεῖν ἀσθενές, μὴ τυχὸν τοῦ εἶναι.

APPENDIX H. (Pages 182, 183.)

ON THE AGE OF XENOPHON.

§ 1. As the passages referred to in the text have, with modern commentators, been made the groundwork of opinions regarding Xenophon's age, different from that here adopted, some more detailed explanation will be desirable, of the evidence on which our own conclusions rest.

How far Xenophon's account of the Symposium, or Banquet, of Callias, may be strictly historical, is a point which, while not perhaps beyond the reach of controversy, is of little importance to the chronological question here at stake. The Panathenaic victory of Autolycus (OL. LXXXIX. B.C. 420) is a well ascertained epoch²; and it is not to be supposed that Xenophon would represent either his own age, or the ages of his friends, as different at that particular date from what they really were.

As was to be expected from the connexion between the master of the feast and the principal guest, the conversation is in great part devoted to that favourite topic in the Socratic circle, the amorous intercourse between males. The company seems also to

¹ Fragmenta Gorgiæ ap. Baierum, Oratt. Att. § 5. 19. 21. 26.

² Schneider, Præfat. ad Conv. Xen. p. 129. sqq.

have been chosen with appropriate reference to the sentiment in which the banquet originated, and to the age of the person in whose honour it was held. Autolycus, as victor in the "Boys' Pancration," could not have been above fifteen; that age forming the limit between boyhood and puberty. The Erastes or Lover was, with rare exception, much older than the Eromenos or Beloved; and Callias, the brother-in-law of Alcibiades, may have been at this time about thirty. Xenophon, as will appear from the evidence to be adduced, was about the same age as Autolycus, and was invited probably as his friend and playfellow.¹ Another youthful guest, though several years senior to Xenophon, was Critobulus, an enthusiastic pæderast, himself distinguished for personal beauty, and a favourite disciple of Socrates. In the course of the dialogue, the philosopher jocosely takes this young voluptuary to task, for the precocity, as well as the licentious indulgence of his amorous inclinations; and, as evidence of the early age at which they had been developed, calls attention to his want of beard; the only symptom of that badge of manhood being a certain appearance of down creeping over his cheeks below his ears.² He may therefore have been at the most between eighteen and twenty. Critobulus expatiates in glowing language on his love for Clinias the beautiful son of Alcibiades. As Alcibiades could hardly at this time, by reference to the extant notices of his life, have been much past thirty, his son must have been a still younger boy than Autolycus. Allusion is made in the sequel³ of the discussion, to an indecent liberty which Critobulus had taken with Clinias. This impropriety is also noticed by Socrates in the *Memorabilia*⁴, in a dialogue between himself and Xenophon, where the latter is warned by his master against the risk he ran of being corrupted, by his habitual exposure to the lascivious fascinations of the same Critobulus. The whole tenour of this dialogue is to represent Xenophon at the time when it took place, as an inexperienced and innocent boy, and but imperfectly initiated, either for good or evil, in the

¹ It has, however, been shown elsewhere (Vol. IV. p. 202.), that the introduction of youths of tender age to companies of this kind, even on ordinary occasions, was consistent with the rules of Attic society. No weight therefore can attach to the opposite assertion by which Krüger (*De Xenoph. Vit.* p. 274.), in the face of the fact that Autolycus himself was a boy, has endeavoured to support his very paradoxical argument.

² *Symp.* iv. 23.

³ *iv.* 25.

⁴ *i.* iii. 8.

erotic theories of his master, or his fellow-disciples. Socrates accordingly has some difficulty in making him comprehend the extent of his danger, or the precautions suggested for guarding against it.

The youth of Xenophon may further be inferred from his taking no part in the dialogue of the Banquet. Autolycus, himself the king of the feast, is allowed to say but a few words, and those merely in answer to questions addressed to him. Xenophon therefore could not with propriety have introduced himself, or any other equally youthful guest, as participating in the discussion. Had he been a man of from twenty-three to twenty-five years of age, as some have supposed, he would hardly have been contented to act the part of mute on such an occasion. His graphic picture of the profligacy of Critobulus, and of the levity with which Socrates regarded in practice, the same conduct which he condemned in theory, receives its finishing touch, from the allusion which the philosopher casually introduces to the fact that the lover of Clinias was newly married.¹ It was customary for young Athenians of rank to take wife, immediately or shortly after emerging from the age of puberty into that of manhood, which at Athens commenced at eighteen.

In the foregoing remarks, the age of Autolycus, or rather the utmost age which he could have attained at this time (as a point concerning which there can be no dispute), has been assumed as a criterion for that about which youths were commonly made the objects of amorous pursuit by Athenian men of pleasure. This assumption is also borne out, as well by the general tenor of Xenophon's text both in the *Convivium* and the *Memorabilia*, as by specific notices of each work. Exceptions there were no doubt, and a partial one has here been made, on the authority of Socrates himself, in the case of Critobulus, whom the philosopher pointedly describes as combining, owing to the precocity of his habits, the two characters of Erastes and Eromenos.² By the greater number of modern commentators, on the other hand, it has been assumed that, except perhaps Autolycus (whose case they conveniently leave out of the question), all the other persons alluded to in either dialogue, as exposed, by their tender years or beauty, to pæderastian courtship, Xenophon, and the beardless Clinias and Critobulus, were men of from twenty-three to thirty years of age.³ This view we

¹ Symp. II. 3.

² iv. 27, 28.

³ Schneider, *Præfat. ad Conviv.* and note to *Conviv.* iv. 25.; Krüger, *Proleg. de Xen. Sympos.* in *Hist. Philol. Stud.* vol. p. II. p. 289. sqq.

consider as no less repugnant to reasonable probability, than to the evidence on which it professes to be founded. It is repugnant to probability, that of four or five young Eromenoi, present at this banquet, or alluded to in conversation by the guests, the one in whose honour the feast was given should be but fifteen years of age, all the others at least a third older, some nearly double that age. It is repugnant both to the letter and the spirit of the expression by which, in the Attic dialect, persons of this class are designated, *παῖδες* or *τὰ παῖδικά*; terms which were absurd in their application, unless in very rare exceptional cases, to full grown bearded men. It is repugnant to the definition given by Socrates himself, of the growth of a beard as the customary limit which distinguished the age of the Erastes from that of the *παῖδικά*. It is repugnant more especially, in the particular case of Xenophon, to the terms in which Socrates, in the *Memorabilia*¹, warns him of the danger to which he was exposed from the profligate Critobulus. Such language could never have been addressed to a man of three or four and twenty, either in the mode of warning or instruction, as to his intercourse with another man of nearly his own age.

The liberties which have been taken with the Historian's text for the purposes of this argument, are very remarkable. Xenophon, on two several occasions², describes Clinias as a "son of Alcibiades." Krüger³ here, overlooking or ignoring Xenophon's authority altogether, enters into an elaborate but resultless discussion of the question, who the father of Clinias may have been. In the same place he speculates on the relative ages of Critobolus and Clinias, by reference to the length of their beards, as specified by Socrates⁴; Socrates having, in the passages appealed to, plainly stated that Critobolus had no beard; nothing but a little down in front of his ears, symptomatic of the approach of one. The other part of the text is obscure, perhaps corrupt; but, in so far as intelligible, its most natural import is, that Clinias had still less beard than Critobolus, nothing but a little down creeping up towards his ears from the nape of his neck.⁵ According to Krüger, Xenophon was at this time about twenty-three; Critobolus the same age or a year or two older; Clinias probably as much older than Critobolus, or about twenty-six or twenty-seven. How any person, conversant with Attic or Socratic language and habits,

¹ L. iii. 9. sqq.² Memor. I. iii. 8. 10.³ Proleg. ad Symp. p. 202.⁴ IV. 23.⁵ Conf. Schneider, note ad Conv. iv. 25.

can, by a perusal of the portions of the *Convivium* and *Memorabilia* here referred to, have been led to suppose Critobulus junior to Clinias, is not easy to comprehend.

The difficulties which have been started by Schneider¹ and others, as to this Clinias having been the son of the celebrated Alcibiades, while resting in great part evidently on the fallacious view taken by them of the age of the former, are of no weight against Xenophon's distinct statement of his paternity. Nor need it be matter of surprise, that no notice of him should occur except in these passages of the Historian; for it is remarkable how little is known of the children of Alcibiades, beyond the fact that he had several. As he did not marry until after B.C. 429², he could not have had a legitimate son, but as he was a profligate from his earliest youth, he may very probably have had a natural son, of advanced boyhood at this time.

§ 2. A few remarks are subjoined, on the other body of evidence, supplied by the *Anabasis*, relative to the Historian's age.

On the night after the massacre of the Zabatus, Xenophon, in

¹ Ad Sympos. iv. 25.

² Isocrates, De Big. 12. There can be little doubt that Alcibiades was a good deal older at the time of his death in 404 B.C., than he is commonly represented by modern chronologers. Isocrates (*loc. cit.*) makes his own son describe him as having been left an orphan (not an infant) in 447 B.C., the year of the battle of Corone. He may therefore very reasonably be supposed to have been then a boy of seven or eight years old, which would bring his birth back to 455 B.C. He was present (Plut. in vit. 7.) at the battle of Potidæa in 432 B.C.; and as no Athenian could serve in regular warfare before the age of twenty, twenty-three would be an appropriate age for him at that time. These dates are also consistent with the dialogue which Xenophon describes his having held, when not quite twenty, with Pericles (*Memor. i. ii. 40.*); there being no reason to suppose that dialogue to have taken place so immediately before the death of Pericles in 429, as is assumed in the common estimate of his young kinsman's age. Nor can the additional notice of Xenophon, here in question, that Alcibiades had in 420 B.C. a son about as old as Clinias is there implied to have been, or about fifteen, be reasonably left out of the account.

Clinton very strangely places his birth in 447, the year of his father's death; in which case he would have been but fifteen at the battle of Potidæa, and eighteen at the death of Pericles. The statement of Nepos that he died at forty, on which all the other more exaggerated views of his precocity are founded, is altogether absurd.

his soliloquy in bed, as reported by himself, expresses his resolution not to be deterred by the immaturity of his age, from acting the part of counsellor to his fellow-warriors. In the sequel¹, addressing the men of his own division, he repeats the same sentiment, to the effect, that if they prefer him to any one else as their leader, he will not plead his youth as a reason for declining the office.

There is something so strange, even absurd, in the notion of language like this having been used, otherwise than in jest, by a man of from forty-four to forty-eight years of age, that one feels more disposed to wonder how such a thing could ever have found favour with intelligent commentators², than, by any serious counter-argument, to meet the elaborate disquisitions in which they have attempted to justify their view. The wonder becomes the greater, when it is remembered, that the previous commander of the same division had just before been described³, without a word of explanation or remark, as but thirty years old at the time of his death; two others of the slain generals, Agias and Socrates, as but forty; and Clearchus, a veteran leader of the Peloponnesian war, the virtual commander-in-chief of the whole army, as scarcely fifty, by the same Xenophon, who (at forty-five, as is supposed) so emphatically dwells on his own youth, as an obstacle to his appointment to one of the vacant commands. In a subsequent passage he describes himself and Timasion, another of the newly selected chiefs, as the youngest of the seven.⁴

By those who are inclined to take a more common-sense view of the case⁵, Xenophon's conception of the limits between military youth and old age, will be better understood from his subsequent account of the arrangements made for the progress of the army from Trapezus to Byzantium. It having been found impossible to provide sea transport for the whole force, the sick, the men above forty, the women and children, were, he tells us, sent by sea to Cerasus.⁶ The rest took the land route to the same port. To

¹ III. i. 14. 25.

² Schneider, Præf. ad Hellenica, p. ix. sqq.; Letronne, Biograph. Univers. tom. LI. p. 370.; Krüger, De Xenoph. Vita, in Hist. Philolog. Studien, vol. II. p. 264. sqq.; Delbrück, Xenoph. p. 12.: conf. Hutchinson, Dissert. p. 4. in Thieme's edit. of Xenoph. vol. I.

³ II. vi.

⁴ III. ii. 37.

⁵ On this more reasonable side of the question see Hutchinson, loc. cit.; Mitford, Hist. of Gr. ch. xxiii. note to sect. I.; Daunou, Cours d'Études Hist. vol. XI. p. 14.

⁶ v. iii. 1. sqq.

assume from this that Xenophon, or his fellow-generals, considered a man of forty as incapacitated by old age for a few days of ordinary land march, would be a fallacy little short of that which we are here endeavouring to rectify. The passage however proves, that he considered forty as the term at least when mature manhood begins to verge toward old age; and hence obviously, that it would have been ridiculous for him, in another chapter of the same work, to represent a man upwards of forty, as incapacitated by his youth for any office requiring maturity of years. Nor need we remind those familiar with the narrative of the *Anabasis*, that Xenophon there everywhere represents himself as in the prime of manhood, and endowed with an unusual amount of activity both of body and mind; as setting an example to all around him of indefatigable energy and endurance; as placing himself, on repeated occasions, at the head of bodies of the youngest and most active of the troops, expressly selected on account of their youth for the most fatiguing service, and as dismounting from his horse, and in his cavalry armour, charging up steep hills, on foot, the better to maintain the ardour and the pace of his men.¹

By reference to these passages and reasons, we have found difficulty in allowing him, at this date, even as much as the thirty-six years, which result from the evidence above cited of his having been about fifteen at the time of the Banquet of Callias. Nor in truth can this result be well reconciled with his own language, otherwise than by assuming the youthful incapacity to which he refers, to have consisted at least as much in his previous inexperience of military command, in comparison with the surviving generals, as in his actual inferiority of age.

Among the arguments adduced, of the Historian's advanced age at the time when he obtained the rank of general, one of the weakest is that founded² on the supposition of Seuthes, a year afterwards, that he might then possibly have had a marriageable daughter. By reference to the foregoing illustrations of Attic social life, an Athenian of seven and thirty, which age Xenophon would on our own data then have reached, might have been a father of several such children. Still less to the purpose are the appeals that have been made to passages of the classics, in which the

¹ III. iv. 41. sq. 48., IV. ii. 16., IV. iii. 20., VII. iii. 45.

² Letronne, *Biograph. sup. cit.* p. 371.; Krüger, *De Xenoph. Vit.* p. 274.

terms "youth," or "young man" (*νέος, νεανίσκος*), are applied in familiar mood to men advanced in life. One might as well argue, from the similar application, in our own comedies or familiar dialogues, of the phrases "my boy" or "old boy," to elderly persons, that the age of boyhood was understood in England to extend to fifty or sixty years. This fallacy assumes a graver character in Krüger's citation¹ of Xenophon's remark², that Agesilaus was *ἐνὶ νέος*, when he became king of Sparta, he being then forty, as a "striking evidence that men of that age were commonly called youths." The reverse were the more probable inference. What Xenophon evidently means is, not that Agesilaus was a young man, but that he was not yet an old one, when he obtained the royal dignity; that he was not yet past the prime of life. Had Agesilaus, at forty, appeared before the ephori, and pleaded his youth, either as a reason for declining the office, or as an apology for any incapacity he might manifest for its duties if he accepted it, there would have been some analogy between his case, and that of Xenophon as supposed by Krüger.

APPENDIX J. (Page 193.)

ON THE BATTLE OF CUNAXA.

PLUTARCH³, in his very shallow commentary on the conduct of Clearchus in this battle, blames him, on grounds which he assigns, and by a palpable misunderstanding of the text of Xenophon, not for declining to execute the Prince's order to charge the Persian centre, but for having, in arranging the line of battle, reserved for himself, from the first, the right of the position, instead of taking post opposite the king. Xenophon's own account⁴ certainly implies, that even if it was not by express order of Cyrus (as is most probable), that the Greeks were stationed on the right, with their flank resting on the river, their occupation of that post was, and with all reason, sanctioned and approved by the Prince. The Euphrates was the key of the whole position: and its protection was indispensable, not merely to the gaining of the battle, but to

¹ De Xenoph. Vit. p. 268.

³ In Arttox. 8.

² In Agesil. i. 6.

⁴ i. viii. 4. sqq.

the preservation of the army in case of defeat; a possible contingency which no wise commander would overlook. It was therefore all-important that the river-bank should be occupied by a force qualified to maintain it. To have intrusted it to a body of Asiatics, who would probably have fled at once when opposed, four to one, by the choice troops of Tissaphernes, would have been nearly as injudicious a course as that which Cyrus afterwards proposed. The importance so wisely attached by Clearchus to the Euphrates as a flank protection, is further manifest¹ in his subsequent manœuvres, where in drawing up his army for the second engagement, he takes up a position with the river immediately in his rear, to prevent his being, not merely outflanked but surrounded; and again, he is equally careful to have his left wing resting on the river, on his retrograde march the next day to join Arisæus.² The care with which Xenophon, on both occasions, particularises this precaution as having been taken, shows how fully he too appreciated its wisdom. It must also be remembered that, according to a first principle of the Greek art of war, the best troops were stationed on the right, not only as the post of honour, but as that from which the tone and character were imparted to an action; and the Lacedæmonians had, from time immemorial, been entitled and accustomed to occupy that position, when forming part of a mixed army. It would therefore, apart from purely strategic considerations, have been a dangerous course, suddenly to transfer them, and without previous explanation, to a different part of the line, and assign the post of honour to others. It might have offended their pride and damped their ardour, at the moment when the victory depended on the maintenance of those feelings in their full vigour.

Nor can there be a doubt that Clearchus, from the tone of his reply to Cyrus, felt confident of winning the battle in his actual position, and had formed his plans accordingly. That he would beat the part of the enemy's line opposed to himself was, humanly speaking, certain. If Cyrus was equally successful on his part, the matter was settled. If not, Clearchus felt probably little less confident that a renewal of the engagement, between his own thoroughly trained Hellenes and any number of half-disciplined Asiatics, disordered by previous success, would insure him the ultimate victory. These anticipations, it need scarcely be added, were all fully verified

¹ I. x. 9.² II. ii. 4.

in the sequel, and under circumstances less favourable, owing to the mad folly of Cyrus, than Clearchus had a right to expect.

Plutarch's flippancy and want of judgement as a military critic, in this instance at least, further appear from his imputation against Clearchus, of having been influenced to the course he took by considerations of personal safety ; a charge in itself absurd in the case of a distinguished Spartan veteran of the Peloponnesian war, and without a shadow of foundation in the facts of this case. The terms in which Xenophon narrates both this transaction, and the whole subsequent series of conflicts, seem clearly, though indirectly to prove, that he thought Clearchus in the right.

If Cyrus had wished the Greeks to be opposed to the part of the line where his brother was, he ought to have stationed them from the first opposite the enemy's centre, which he knew to be the position of the king.¹ He seems however, in the first instance, to have selected the post in question for himself, from a desire in person to engage, and wreak his vengeance on Artaxerxes. But as the moment of attack approached, he suddenly changed his mind, when it was too late to change his line of battle, and gave an order which, with the other peculiarities of his conduct, would imply, as remarked in the text, that from excitement of one kind or other he had lost his head.

Isocrates² who, if not a more competent judge, had much better opportunities than Plutarch, of knowing and estimating the merits of the case, plainly attributes the loss of the battle to the desperate rashness of Cyrus.

APPENDIX K. (Page 196.)

ON THE CONDUCT OF ARÆUS AFTER THE BATTLE OF CUNAXA.

THE whole tenor of Xenophon's narrative here seems to prove, that Aræus was playing a double game from the first ; although Xenophon shows no suspicion of his treachery until it was openly avowed. In the battle he seems to have made but a feeble attack, if any, on the part of the royal army to which he was opposed ;

¹ i. viii. 21.

² Epist. II., and Philippus, p. 64. Didot.

and the moment he hears of the death of Cyrus he retires from the field. Nor is there any appearance of his having been pursued. All this looks very like a secret understanding betwixt him and Artaxerxes. There is still stronger evidence that his invitation to the Greeks to join with him on his proposed retreat to Ionia, was but a trap to place them in the power of the king. What hope could Ariæus entertain of safety by returning, still under rebel colours, to Ionia, a province now thoroughly in the king's interest? He could not think of making war on the loyal satraps Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus, backed by the whole power of the Persian empire. His obvious course, if he and the king were not already on terms, was to make his peace on the spot. A proposal of cooperation in measures for the destruction of his late Greek allies, could not fail to prove an irresistible bribe to the royal clemency. The subsequent transactions still more clearly evince his insidious dealing with the Greeks. It is surprising that neither Xenophon¹, nor any one of his commentators, should have observed the glaring inconsistency between the plan arranged with Clearchus for their march westward, and the route actually taken under the satrap's guidance. In the conference betwixt him and the Greek commanders it was settled, on his recommendation, that they should endeavour in the first instance, by day's journeys of extra length in an opposite direction from the king's quarters, to get beyond the reach of pursuit.² But instead of leading them towards the west, the only direction in harmony with his own advice, he guides their course a little to the south of east, toward the same point where they had left Artaxerxes after the battle; and accordingly, on the afternoon of the first day's march, they find themselves in the vicinity of the royal camp.³ It seems clear therefore, that the report of the king's army having crossed the Tigris⁴, which prevented Clearchus from renewing his attack, was a falsehood, for which there can be little doubt Ariæus was responsible.

One object of this whole proceeding, and of the subsequent junction and further march in company with Tissaphernes, evidently was to entice the Greeks across the Tigris. Add to all this the close intercourse which commenced, immediately after the

¹ There is however a curious ambiguity in his allusion (II. ii. 13.) to the favourable interposition of fortune, in preventing them from running away, and reserving them for a nobler species of retreat.

² II. ii. 12.

³ II. ii. 14.

⁴ II. ii. 3.

battle, between Ariæus and Menon, whose fidelity seems all along to have been suspected by both Clearchus and Xenophon.¹ The difficulty is to understand how they could have been the dupes of a series of manœuvres, the insidious nature of which the position of the sun on the first day's march ought to have made apparent.

APPENDIX L. (Page 241.)

ON THE BANISHMENT OF XENOPHON.

IN the text here referred to, after informing us that, when setting out with Agesilaus on his Coronæan campaign, he deposited his Artemisian treasures with Megabyzus the priest of Ephesus, to be disposed of according to future contingencies, the Historian continues: *ἐπεὶ δ' ἔφυγεν ὁ Ξενοφῶν, κατοικοῦντος ἤδη αὐτοῦ ἐν Σκιλλοῦντι, ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων οἰκισθέντι παρὰ τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν, ἀφικνεῖται Μεγάβυζος εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν, θεωρήσων . . .*

The difficulty which the expression *ἐπεὶ δ' ἔφυγεν κ. τ. λ.* seems to interpose in the way of the view here advocated, has been well met by Bishop Thirlwall in the Philological Museum.² The conjunction *ἐπεὶ* must here be taken, not in its familiar chronological sense, but as an expletive or causative particle, with which power it is frequently invested by older Attic writers, especially by Thucydides, and which it also possesses though less frequently with Xenophon. It must be understood as indicating, not so much the time of the banishment, as the fact that Xenophon when he settled at Scillus was a banished man; and indirectly that his residence, on his return to Greece, in a distant part of Peloponnesus, under Spartan protection, was a consequence of his exile. The words therefore: *ἐπεὶ δ' ἔφυγεν ὁ Ξενοφῶν, κατοικοῦντος ἤδη αὐτοῦ ἐν Σκιλλοῦντι* may be rendered, to adopt the translation and commentary of Dr. Thirlwall: "When Xenophon, in consequence of his banishment, was residing at Scillus." For the principal "fact was the residence at Scillus. The cause of the banishment "had nothing to do with the history of the deposit; and therefore "the words in substance, though not in form, are equivalent to:

¹ II. ii. 1., iv. 15., v. 28.

² Vol. I. p. 516.: conf. Krüger, *Histor. Philol. Stud.* pt. I. p. 244.

“ἐπεὶ φύγας ὣν ὁ Ξενοφῶν κατῴκει ἡδὴ ἐν Σκαλλοῦντι.” We appeal with the greater confidence to the authority of this eminent scholar, from the circumstance that his leaning seems rather to be, as was in truth our own on a first imperfect consideration of the case, in favour of the Coronæan theory.

APPENDIX M. (Page 280.)

ON THE CASE OF THE SIX ADMIRALS AFTER ARGINUSÆ.

As we shall have occasion in the sequel to deal somewhat unmercifully with Xenophon's real sins against historical truth, we feel the more bound to vindicate him when unjustly charged with similar offences. To such treatment he seems to have been subjected by our own two leading Greek historians, Thirlwall and Grote, in their judgements on this portion of his narrative; which it will here therefore be proper to examine somewhat more in detail, than were consistent with propriety in our principal text.

Xenophon very clearly though concisely gives his own view of the case of the drowned seamen, at the close of his account of the battle: “The Athenian commanders,” he tells us, “sent the trierarchs Theramenes and Thrasybulus with forty-seven vessels, to the relief of the men on the wrecks, while the rest of the fleet should sail to Mytilene to attack the Spartan squadron in that port. But a violent storm supervening, prevented the performance of either service.”¹ On the arrival of the six admirals at Athens, the narrative continues², “it was urged in council by several citizens, but especially by Theramenes³, that the admirals should be impeached for neglecting to save the mariners; and in proof that they themselves imputed blame to no other person, he appealed to a letter addressed by them to the council, in which they described the storm as the sole cause of the duty remaining unperformed. In reply, each of the admirals gave a brief explanation of the facts, the customary forms not then admitting a more detailed

¹ I. vi. 35.

² c. vii.

³ It may be presumed, from no mention being made of Thrasybulus, as taking part in these proceedings, that he had remained in the performance of his duties with the fleet. No reasonable tribunal, it need scarcely be remarked, would ever have passed judgment in the case without hearing his evidence.

“vindication of their conduct. They stated, that they had instructed Theramenes and Thrasybulus, with other competent officers, to attend to the shipwrecked men, while they went in quest of the enemy: if blame therefore attached anywhere, it must be to those who had neglected their instructions. But, they added, although they have wrongly accused us, we shall not act the same part by them, considering, as we do, the storm a sufficient reason for the non-execution of our orders. And they offered to produce from among the pilots and mariners, numerous witnesses in proof of their statement. The assembly was satisfied with this explanation, and many were desirous that a vote to that effect should at once be taken. But, owing to the lateness of the hour, it was agreed to postpone further proceedings to a future meeting.” In the interval a violent reaction took place in the public feeling, chiefly through the efforts of Theramenes, who, with his agents, by expedients which the Historian describes, inflamed the minds of the people against the admirals. His designs were favoured by the occurrence at this season, of the festival of the Apaturia, among the principal solemnities of which were social meetings of tribes and families, occasions peculiarly calculated to bring home painfully to the feelings, the bereavement of near friends and relatives. The result was, that one Callixenus undertook to renew the dormant impeachment at the next assembly, by a motion that, as the case had been heard at the last meeting, the council should at once proceed to judgment, and that the decision should be taken on the whole six defendants by a single vote. To this it was objected by Euryptolemus and others, on behalf of the admirals, that such a course would be contrary to the law which guaranteed a separate trial to every Attic citizen indicted for a capital offence.¹ But they would not listen to him, shouting that “it were a strange thing if the Athenians were not allowed to administer justice in their own way, and that whoever presumed to offer opposition, should be included in the same sentence with the admirals.” Intimidated by this menace, the Prytanes agreed, with the single dissentient voice of Socrates, who happened to be in office that year, that the people should be left to take their own course. Euryptolemus being then permitted to address the assembly, after passing in review the previous transactions, again besought them not to withhold from each

¹ Mr. Grote's view of the law of Canonus (p. 267. note) is assuredly the most reasonable and correct.

defendant his privilege of a separate full and fair trial ; in order that the assembly might at least be able to found its verdict on its own investigation, rather than on the bare assertions of the accusers. It was resolved however to proceed at once, and the whole six were condemned and put to death. The only new fact of any importance which transpired in the speech of Euryptolemus, was, that one of the six accused had been himself among the strugglers for life on the sinking vessels, but had managed to effect his escape by his own exertions. So little therefore could he have been responsible for the death of others, that, at the moment when his colleagues were deliberating on the means of saving life, he was one of those whose life was at stake. And the orator undertook to prove, by the evidence of this witness, that the storm rendered it impossible to afford relief. But no attention was paid to the appeal, and he shared the fate of the rest.

We have here the entire substance of this melancholy episode of Athenian history as recorded by Xenophon. By the two modern historians above cited his narrative has been censured as meagre and confused, and he has himself been charged with wilfully suppressing facts indispensable to a just appreciation of the case. It may indeed be true that Xenophon has here, as elsewhere, been far more sparing of details and of illustrative remark than were to be wished. But his statement, although containing much that is hard to reconcile with modern principles of law or justice, is, as it stands, distinct and intelligible ; and what is more, uncontradicted, directly or indirectly, by any other authority. Of partiality we discover no trace ; and no more effectual refutation of that charge can be desired than, as stated in the text above, the conflicting grounds on which it has been rested by its own supporters. The hypothesis that Xenophon has, from corrupt motives, omitted some important element of the question, seems to have originated mainly in a disinclination to believe, that Theramenes could have had the audacity to found an impeachment of his superiors on so nugatory or even self-condemnatory a basis ; or that any sane tribunal would have followed up such an impeachment in such a manner. It has therefore been assumed, that there must have been some serious flaw in the case of the accused, some real neglect of duty, which Theramenes stated, but which Xenophon has suppressed ; and all sorts of subtle speculations have been hazarded, as to what this mysterious point of real culpability may have been. That these conjectures are as groundless as super-

fluous, seems clearly to result, even from those portions of Xenophon's statement which have not been called in question. Granting however that he may have had some motive for falsifying or suppressing, it seems incredible that all antiquity should have become the accomplice of his fraud. The Attic republic, with all her faults, was dear to the Hellenic nation. Around Athens their associations of the common country's glory, and still more of her moral and intellectual ascendancy, were in every age chiefly concentrated. It were therefore hardly conceivable, that the whole historical literature of Greece should have conspired in allowing a case so deeply affecting Athenian honour, to pass down to posterity, curtailed of the only palliating circumstances which it presented, and of which it stood so greatly in need. Yet nowhere is there a trace of the conduct, either of the six admirals or of their judges, having been viewed in any other light than that in which it is represented, first by Xenophon, and afterwards by Diodorus and other later writers, as the organs doubtless of more nearly contemporaneous authorities.

It is indeed remarkable, that the only supplementary fact bearing on the vital merits of the case, for which we are indebted to other sources, should tend still further to exculpate the admirals. Diodorus¹, after Theopompus probably, asserts, that owing to the virulence of the storm, they were not only prevented from enforcing their order, but that the seamen refused to perform the duty required of them. It may be added that Diodorus², while differing in various points from Xenophon, stigmatises the absolute injustice of the sentence in language so strong and so unqualified, as it seems hardly possible he could have used, had he ever heard of their being charged in any trustworthy quarter with even a modified culpability.

It may seem no doubt a strange thing to ordinary men, that so cunning a manœuvrer as Theramenes should have brought forward against others, a charge which could hardly fail to recoil on himself. But the acts of men like Theramenes, notorious as the most reckless political intriguer of an age so fertile in such characters, are not to be judged by the same rules as those of ordinary men. The accusation did in fact recoil on himself. The statement by the admirals, of the real facts, was so satisfactory, that the assembly would have acquitted them, had there been time and light for taking the votes. This first part of the proceedings,

¹ XIII. 100.

² c. 102. sq.

Xenophon's account of which has never been impugned, shows in itself that the indictment, as laid by Theramenes, comprised no more valid grounds of crimination than those to which Xenophon has limited the admirals' apology. Would their allegation that the storm prevented their saving the men on the wrecks have satisfied the assembly, if Theramenes had rested his case on the ground of their having had plenty of opportunity to save the men before the storm came on, of their having neglected that opportunity, of their having failed to employ a competent number of vessels and hands for the purpose, or on any other of the conjectural subtleties which have now been conjured up, for the purpose of blackening the character of the unfortunate commanders, and shielding the democracy? And if not here, at what other stage of the proceedings could this supposed vital count of the indictment have been brought forward? The case never having again been tried, the accused never again confronted with the accusers, and the latter having admitted that the evidence on which, in the second assembly, they demanded a verdict of guilty, was identical with that on which they had in the first assembly intended to award a verdict of acquittal. The case of the admiral on the wreck could not, at least, have been affected by any such supposed supplementary evidence; and those who hurried one clearly innocent man to execution, would not be very scrupulous as to five others, whose conduct was at least questionable.

The turn taken by events in the interval between the two meetings, seems not altogether inexplicable in a state of society so reckless of human life as republican Greece. There was no want in the present case of influences, sufficient, in the hands of unscrupulous agents, to inflame the Attic popular passion to the pitch that required to be appeased by a sacrifice of innocent lives. The fact was certain that a number of Athenian citizens had been left to perish in the sea. Those charged with their safety differed as to the cause. But the fault must lie somewhere. This was no case for tedious litigation. The commanders-in-chief were primarily responsible for what had happened. They were therefore the proper victims. That in order to foster the excitement, the faction of Theramenes may have circulated fresh rumours against the accused, is very possible. But as those rumours never assumed the form of judicial charges, even had they reached Xenophon's ears, they formed no legitimate element of the case. That Xenophon should in this instance have wilfully suppressed any fact, with a

view of exaggerating the crime of his fellow-citizens, were inconsistent with his constitutional indifference to party politics, and with the kindly disposition towards his native republic manifest in this whole portion of his work. This disposition displays itself even in his narrative of these events ; in the testimony so cordially borne at its close, to the revulsion of feeling, which the guilty but at bottom generous community underwent, when sober reflexion brought them to a sense of the enormity into which they had been betrayed, and in the satisfaction with which he describes the punishment of the ringleaders of the bloodthirsty movement.

Dr. Thirlwall, while he has not certainly done justice to Xenophon's account of this transaction, has at least treated both the Historian and his text in an impartial spirit. But Mr. Grote, in his zeal to palliate the errors of his favourite democracy, has judged him with a harshness and unfairness, equal to any exhibited by Xenophon himself towards his own objects of political antipathy. Mr. Grote readily defers to his authority in all cases where favourable to his own view, but dismisses as calumnious or unintelligible whatever cannot be turned to similar account. He even rejects the fact of the storm (admitted by all previous authorities, of all sides and parties, from Theramenes himself down to Diodorus), or at least its alleged virulence, as a pretext of the admirals ; and on what ground ? Because a portion of the Spartan fleet escaped in the same weather to Chios. As if it were the same thing for fugitive galleys to run before a gale of wind to a place of safety, as for a large fleet to beat up against its fury in a narrow sea, picking up drowning mariners among scores of drifting hulks. His zeal seems in one instance to have overshot its mark. He treats as a calumny Xenophon's statement that the popular exasperation against the admirals was excited by Theramenes, and maintains that it was altogether spontaneous. A less partial advocate might perhaps have reflected, that an act which he does not himself deny to have been cruel and illegal, would be more capable of palliation, had its authors been instigated to its commission by the arts of self-interested demagogues, rather than by their own passions. While on this account the question as to the real cause of the excitement bears but little on the general merits, it will be proper, on philological grounds, to correct an erroneous construction which Grote has here put on the text of the Historian. Xenophon states¹ that, "the agents of Theramenes, during the

¹ I. vii. 8.

"feast of the Apaturia, instigated a number of persons to make their appearance at the next assembly with mourning garments and shaved heads, as representing the relatives of the drowned mariners." Such is the real sense of the passage. Subjoined is Mr. Grote's paraphrase of it: "Xenophon describes this burst of feeling at the Apaturia as false and factitious, and the men in mourning as a number of hired impostors;"¹ and he afterwards talks of the bribes that had been paid to them. None of these allegations are justified by the Historian's own statement. The primary import of the term *παρὰσκευάζω*, which Grote renders to "hire" or "bribe," is simply to induce, persuade, instigate. In this primary import it is invariably used by Xenophon in the numerous passages where it occurs. In no single one has he used it in the sense, which it occasionally bears with other writers, of suborning, or influencing by corrupt means, still less of hiring or bribing. Neither do Xenophon's words imply that the mourners, however induced to come forward, were "impostors." All he commits himself to, is the fact that they did not come forward spontaneously, but at the instigation of others. The question whether they were real relatives or sham relatives he leaves open. But the terms of the passage, rightly interpreted, certainly favour the former supposition. Mr. Grote makes Xenophon describe the "burst of feeling" (as he designates the procession of shaved mourners) to have taken place "at the Apaturia;" meaning we presume some of the public sacrifices or great social meetings of that festival. This however is also a misunderstanding. What Xenophon means and says is, not that the mourners officiated at the Apaturia, but that "during the festival," the agents of Theramenes induced them to get up their show of grief for the ensuing assembly, when the case of the admirals again came on. Now this certainly seems to imply that Xenophon considered the mourners as genuine relatives. For the festival of the Apaturia was, as Grote has well shown, calculated to render persons whose friends had perished on the wrecks, peculiarly alive to the influence here exercised on them; but was in no respect a more favourable time than any other, for enlisting the services of ruffians ready at all times, for "hire" or "bribes," to act any part that might be required of them.

¹ P. 261. Bishop Thirlwall also speaks of the mourners as having been hired or bribed.

On a subsequent occasion described in the *Hellenica*¹, Theramenes is accused by Critias of having, when sent by the admirals to save the drowning men, failed to execute that duty, and of having, in order to shield himself, accused his superiors, and caused them to be put to death. In his defence he advances the following statements: I. That the admirals had accused him of disobeying their orders to save the men, before he brought any charge against them; II. That while he had all along maintained, that owing to the storm it was not possible to save the men, they had asserted that it was possible. The accusation of Critias here contains in substance Xenophon's own previous narrative of the affair. The reply of Theramenes contradicts Xenophon's narrative in every particular. Upon this Dr. Thirlwall observes: "It is difficult to believe that 'this account [of Theramenes] was totally false. Yet there seems 'to be a direct contradiction between the plea which he here attributes to the generals, and that which they really used according to Xenophon's own narrative. It looks as if Xenophon had 'purposely involved the transaction in the greatest possible obscurity.'"² The obscurity appears to lie less in Xenophon's narrative, than in the failure of his commentator to apprehend its spirit. It might have occurred to so discerning a critic, that in Greek prose history as in Greek epic poetry, there is a dramatic as well as a descriptive mode of portraying characters. Dr. Thirlwall will not surely insist on making a historian who introduces speeches into his text, responsible for all the assertions which he places in the mouths of his orators, or generally for their intention to speak the truth; and if ever there was a case where such a rule were inapplicable, it is that of Theramenes here in question. Xenophon, in concurrence with the best contemporary authorities, represents this man as a reckless liar. Hence, when charged with the office of portraying himself by his language, now that he is in his turn arraigned as a criminal, he is most appropriately made to resort, for his justification, to the same mendacity by which he had before promoted the destruction of his commanding officers, and betrayed Athens to Lysander. When, after Critias had stated the case as it really was, and as Xenophon himself had stated it, we find Theramenes contradicting both them and himself, we must, in justice to Xenophon, consider the defence as a deliberate falsehood, and as meant by Xenophon to be taken as such. Xenophon,

¹ II. iii. 32. 35. sqq.

² Hist. of Gr. vol. iv. p. 116. note.

no doubt, by a few words of commentary on the perseverance of Theramenes, to the last moment of his life, in his characteristic course of falsehood, might have obviated the possibility of misunderstanding. But he rarely indulges his readers with such explanatory details, and was the less likely to do so in the present case. The lie being so gross and palpable, he would the more readily expect them to discover for themselves the ethic spirit of the passage.

APPENDIX N. (Page 313.)

ON THE INVASION OF LACEDÆMON BY EPAMINONDAS.

THERE can be little doubt that Xenophon has misunderstood or misrepresented, both the tactics and the policy of Epaminondas, in his invasions of Laconia, especially in the last. He would have us believe that the object of the Theban commander was to take or destroy Sparta at all hazards; and that he was foiled in that object by the valour of the small force left in defence of the city. But this view appears as little consistent with the character of Epaminondas, as with the evidence of Xenophon's own text. The part Epaminondas wished to act, was probably similar in some degree to that acted by Sparta towards Athens at the close of the Peloponnesian war; to reduce the city and humble her pride; not to wipe her off the face of Hellas. But this part required to be acted in a different manner, and was far more difficult than that of Lysander, both in respect to the men and the place with which Epaminondas had to deal. On both occasions he endeavoured, and hoped, to take the town by surprise; and had he succeeded, he might, as Xenophon himself remarks, have occupied it at once. But in both instances he was disappointed; and the want of walls, instead of facilitating his object, as Xenophon assumes, proved a serious, indeed an insuperable obstacle to its attainment. Had the city been fortified, he might, like Lysander, have blockaded and starved the population into submission. But an open straggling town could not be reduced to the same extremity, unless at the cost of a much longer time and greater variety of resources than Epaminondas had at command. In regard to other more summary modes of dealing with it, there can be no reasonable doubt that it was completely at his mercy. The notion of from five to ten

thousand men, but a portion of them Spartans, and many of doubtful fidelity, making head in an open unwall'd city against an army of eight or ten times that number, of the best troops in Greece, the "élite" of whom had, in the late wars, been in the habit of beating greatly superior armies of Lacedæmonians, is next to absurd. Historical critics, in their efforts to explain what has appeared to them the inexplicable supineness, or even pusillanimity of Epaminondas on these occasions, as compared with the energy so characteristic of his other enterprises, have dwelt much on the strength of the ground on which part of the city was built, and where the chief force of the defenders was collected. But the weapons to which a commander, resolved at all hazards to conquer or destroy, would here have had recourse, were not arms or battering rams, but torches. Had the latter been employed at any moment by Epaminondas, in a determined manner, backed by the operations of the surrounding army, the valour of the defenders entrenched in the upper town, would have been of as little avail as that of the citizens posted by Agesilaus on the housetops of the streets below. But Epaminondas saw objections, for which Xenophon was not likely to give him credit, to any such extreme course. He saw doubtless that the national feeling of Sparta had been embittered rather than subdued by her late reverses; that the citizens in the mass were animated by much the same spirit of desperation and self-sacrifice which had inspired Leonidas and his three hundred; and that an assault, if completely successful, would in all likelihood be tantamount to the annihilation of the city and people of Sparta. One Thermopylæ was enacted in the passes between Arcadia and Laconia¹, against a detachment of the invading army; and there was every probability that the defenders of the town were prepared to offer up themselves, wives, and children, as a single great holocaust to the cause of national independence, rather than see Sparta in the possession of Thebes. Epaminondas had no wish to drive matters to this extremity; and the only alternative, short of exterminating the rival state, was the course he took, of allowing her to escape altogether, after showing the extent to which he had her in his power. This view of the case explains, and reduces to their proper level, those acts of alleged superhuman valour on the side of the Spartans, and of timidity on that of the Thebans, over which Xenophon exults so

¹ VI. v. 26.

loudly. The exaggeration, apart from the inconsistencies of detail, is so transparent in these narratives as to defeat its own object. The affairs described, where for example Archidamus son of Agesilaus, and hence next to his father Xenophon's favourite hero, with less than a hundred men, puts to flight¹ the whole Theban army, were evidently mere skirmishes of outposts, consequent on the feints and stratagems, by which Epaminondas vainly endeavoured to provoke his able and cautious adversary to battle in the open field.

APPENDIX O. (Page 322.)

ON THE CONNEXION BETWEEN THE PARTS OF XENOPHON'S HELLENICA.

THESE considerations, with the historical gap above noticed between the second and third books, and with one or two vague expressions of the ancient commentators, led Niebuhr² to the hypothesis: that Xenophon's Grecian history consisted of two different narratives; the one, comprising the first two books, and forming a supplement to Thucydides; the other, comprising the remaining five books, being the Hellenica in the proper sense; and that the first of these narratives had been originally connected by its author, as a ninth book, with the eight of Thucydides; from which it had again been detached by later editors and prefixed to the Hellenica. This theory has been, in the extent to which Niebuhr carried it, so generally and so justly rejected by other commentators³, as to render it unnecessary here to controvert the arguments of its author. The utmost that can reasonably be admitted, on the data referred to by Niebuhr, is, that what now forms the first two books, and which we shall here for brevity's sake call the "Attica," was probably, it may almost be said certainly, composed before the rest of the work; and that it may

¹ VII. v. 12.

² Rheinisch. Museum, 1827, p. 194. sq.; Kleine histor. Schriften, p. 304.; and in the Philological Museum, vol. I. p. 485.

³ G. C. Lewis, in the Classical Museum, No. 4. p. 1. sqq.; Krüger, Historisch. philolog. Studien. I. Th. p. 244. sqq.; Sievers, Commentatt. de Xenophontis Hellenicis, p. 2. sqq.; Breitenbach, Præf. ad Xenophontis Hellenica, p. 1. sqq. (1853.)

have retained its separate character, either in circulation or in the author's repositories, for a time, before the subsequent series of *Hellenica* was sufficiently matured, to admit of the two elements being united as we now have them. It is further quite possible, that the author may at first have intended the *Attica* to rank as a distinct work, and may only have been led by his ensuing course of historical research to dispose of it in a different manner.

That the *Attica* could ever have been composed as a Supplement in the literal sense, and to the extent assumed by Niebuhr, of having been actually added as a ninth Book or Muse to the eight of Thucydides, is precluded, among other considerations, by one which it is surprising Niebuhr should have overlooked. Although it takes up the subject of Thucydides exactly where he breaks off¹, it carries on its own subject far beyond the point, which he everywhere so distinctly defines at the conclusion of his great historical epopee, the close of the twenty-seven years' war with the fall of Athens. It would be an injustice to Xenophon, to deny him also a sufficient share of taste and judgment to perceive, that any addition to the work of his predecessor, which extended its narrative beyond that catastrophe, would be not so much a supplement, as an unseemly excrescence on his original design. The fact therefore, that Xenophon has comprised in his *Attic* narrative an entirely new series of events, standing in no sort of epic connexion with the Peloponnesian war, is a proof that, although that narrative was a continuation, it never could have been destined as a supplement or completion in Niebuhr's sense, to the work of Thucydides.

Niebuhr's theory, to be consistent, ought to assume Xenophon's Thucydidean supplement to have closed with what is now the second chapter of the second book; and that the remainder of that book either belonged to the *Hellenica*, or was a separate historical tract on the affairs of the Thirty tyrants. This arrangement how-

¹ This has indeed been disputed by Sievers (op. cit. p. 8. sqq.) and Thirlwall (Hist. of Gr. vol. iv. 2nd ed. p. 62.), who discover an interval of six weeks between the close of the one work and the commencement of the other; and even go the length of assuming, that the opening part of Xenophon's text has been lost. It does not however appear that this interval of time, even admitting its existence, comprised any transaction of greater importance than others which Xenophon is in the habit of omitting in his, at all times, more or less meagre and inexplicit narrative. Conf. Grote, vol. viii. p. 155. sqq.

ever, in proportion as it might have favoured one part of his argument in favour of original distinctness, would have been destructive of another vital one, founded on the lively Attic patriotism which animates the first two books, as contrasted with the recreant Laconism of the ensuing five; that patriotism being chiefly exhibited in the chapters which would thus have been lopped off.

Whatever may have been its author's earlier intention, conclusive proof that the *Attica* was ultimately united to the *Hellenica*, is supplied by the connexion between the concluding passage of the one and the opening passage of the other. The *Attica* closes with the permanent reconciliation of parties in Athens after the expulsion of the Thirty. The *Hellenica* (B. III.) begins with the words: "In this way the strife of factions at Athens terminated." The mode in which the resettlement of the democratic constitution is described in the last sentence of the *Attica*, also proves indirectly that this part of its text was finally published in its existing form, at the same late period of Xenophon's life in which the *Hellenica* was brought to its present state of maturity. After mentioning the restoration of harmony among the different orders of citizens, and the oaths mutually taken to abide by the new settlement, the Historian adds, in an encomiastic tone: "And to this day, that political harmony has been maintained, and those oaths have been observed." These expressions were obviously out of place, either in speech or writing, if uttered, as Niebuhr supposes, about eight years after the event. It were but a poor compliment to a national system of polity, to describe it as having actually lasted eight years. But the compliment, if pronounced nearly half a century later, or in 356 B.C., down to which date we know Xenophon to have been engaged with the *Hellenica*, would have been highly appropriate; a fifty years' duration of any political settlement, in any Greek state but Sparta, being a rare and gratifying phenomenon. And the remark in this case is the more valuable in a historical point of view, as affording Xenophon's testimony to the fact, known to us from other sources, that the political harmony eulogised by him actually did subsist down to the close of his own life. Niebuhr indeed has put a very different construction on Xenophon's expression above cited; and endeavours to show, by a line of argument which we do not clearly comprehend, and for which the reader is referred to his own text, that the Historian alludes to the shortness, rather than the length of the interval, between the date at which he wrote and the resettlement

of affairs to which the passage refers. Let us take a case nearer home ; and suppose, that some eight or ten years after the passing of our own Reform Bill, an admirer of that measure, having occasion, in parliament, to refer to its results, were to have wound up his discourse by the peroration that, "to this day the people of England continue to revere and uphold that settlement of the constitution," the audience would have thought he was dreaming, or that his enthusiasm for his subject had turned his head. But a similar speech delivered half a century later, would sound but as a somewhat hyperbolical tribute of admiration.

APPENDIX P. (Page 373.)

ON THE DIVISION OF GREEK HISTORICAL WORKS INTO BOOKS.¹

No internal evidence of a similar method of distribution is to be found in the *Cyropædia*, or in other more bulky compositions of Xenophon.

While upon this subject we shall, for its more complete illustration, extend our remarks to the remaining historical compositions of the Attic period, of which we shall have occasion to treat in the sequel of this volume. The loss of their entire texts disables us from judging on internal evidence, what may have been the method of division adopted by their authors. In regard to Ephorus however, we learn from Diodorus², that in his great historical work he followed a mode of distribution nearly resembling that of the *Anabasis*, each of its thirty books being limited to a single subject or class of subjects, each with its separate *Proœmium* or Introduction, and, it would also appear, in some cases at least, its separate title. One of those titles, that of the fifth book, the *Europa*, has been quoted by Strabo.

The citations of the other elder or younger contemporaries of Xenophon, of the thirteen books of Philistus for example, the twenty-three of Ctesias (his *Persica*), or the fifty-eight and twelve of Theopompus (his *Philippica* and *Hellenica*), supply no similar

¹ The division of the books into chapters or sections are, in the works, both of Xenophon and his predecessors, due to modern editors.

² XVI. 76.

criteria for judging, how far those numbers may have been sanctioned by the authors, how far they may be due, as is indeed more likely, to the later grammarians.

The standard historians of this period, and their commentators, have left us in a similar state of uncertainty regarding the original titles of their works. It seems probable that the old logographers, including Herodotus, designated their compilations by no other titles than "Histories," "Genealogies," or others of like general import. The earliest extant citation of a historical work by a specific title, is that of the "Attic history" of Hellanicus, by Thucydides.¹ The same author, in his Proœmium, appears also indirectly to entitle his own work a "History (*συγγραφή*) of the war "between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians." Neither Herodotus nor Xenophon has afforded any so near an approach to a specific designation. Polybius² plainly, though indirectly, intimates, that the titles *Hellenica* and *Philippica*, by which the two principal works of Theopompus are now known, were applied to them by Theopompus himself. No such distinct notice exists of those originally borne by the works of his contemporaries. But from the analogy of his usage, it may reasonably be supposed, that the same title of *Hellenica* was also given to the principal work of Xenophon by its author.

This whole question has been treated with great ability by Sir G. C. Lewis, in the *Classical Museum* for 1844 (p. 1. sqq.), to which the reader desirous of going deeper into the subject is referred. Sir G. appears however to have carried his critical scepticism a little too far, in assuming the absolutely undivided state of the texts of Herodotus, Thucydides, and other earlier historians, as published by themselves. When Herodotus, referring in v. 36. to § 92. of the existing book i. of his work, uses the expression *ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν λόγων*, "in the first of my narratives," or discourses, we apprehend that the words "the first" necessarily imply that there was "a second;" and if a second, probably a third, and so forth; although he may not happen afterwards to have quoted by its specific number any one of his other divisions; which were evidently much more numerous than the existing books. The first "logos" must have had an end, and the second a beginning; and that end and beginning seem also not difficult to divine from internal data. As the citation in v. 36. refers to § 92. of the present first book, the whole of that book

¹ I. 97.

² VIII. 13.

down to the same § 92. must have been included in the author's first logos. This whole portion of the text is occupied with his Lydian history, terminating with the fall of Sardis, and the subjection of Lydia to the Persians, in § 94. With § 95. a new subject commences ; the origin and progress of the Medo-Persian dynasty by which that of Croesus was overthrown. It may therefore with some confidence be assumed, that the first logos of Herodotus comprised from § 1. to § 94. of the existing first book, and that his second logos commenced with § 95. of the same book.

APPENDIX Q. (Page 445.)

ON THE SOCRATIC DOCTRINES OF XENOPHON.

No. 1.

AMONG the principal rules for a judicious conduct in life, which Xenophon makes Socrates inculcate, one is : That a man ought not to undertake, either himself to perform, or to teach others, any business of which he does not possess a competent knowledge.¹ This rule is enforced, with more immediate reference to the art of war, in a dialogue² with a young friend ambitious of military command ; whom Socrates not only induces to take an extra course of instruction under a distinguished professional tactician, but afterwards, finding that the pupil had not been thoroughly grounded in some important points, he sends him back to his master to make good the deficiency.

One of the ensuing dialogues³ is between Socrates and another friend, who complains, that after a long experience of military duty, after having passed with credit through the inferior grades of rank, and received many wounds in the national service, his claims to a command for which he was a candidate, had been set aside in favour of one who had borne arms for a very short period, with no distinction, and in a secondary rank, having been engaged the greater part of his life in purely civil employments. Here Socrates at once takes the opposite side of the question.

¹ I. vii., II. vi. 38., III. i., III. iii. 9. alibi.

² III. i. 1.

³ III. iv. 1.

He asserts, that a man who has acquired habits of business in a civil office, and shown judgment in its management, is qualified to enter at once on the highest military functions. This argument he follows up by a series of subtleties, to the effect, that as the fortunate candidate, when master of the public ceremonies, had, without being himself either a practical musician or play-actor, succeeded in making other musicians and actors perform well, he must be quite able, without being himself a practised soldier, to make his soldiers fight well and preserve discipline.

This fallacy the philosopher is again made to refute in a subsequent discourse¹, where, in remarking on the decline of military discipline in Athens, he says: that while no Athenian citizen would ever think of undertaking the presidency of the public ceremonies, without a competent knowledge of that department of business, many altogether devoid of military experience have no hesitation in undertaking military commands.

No. 2.

It seems incredible that Socrates could ever really have committed himself to the following course of mixed paradox and casuistry. "He maintained² that the men who really governed states, were "not those who held the sceptre, or those elected to power, or those "who governed by force or fraud, but those who understood how "to govern; that in like manner the man who governed a ship, "was he who best understood navigation, and that to him both the "shipmaster and the other passengers deferred; that the landowner "followed the instructions of the skilful agriculturist; and so, in "other cases." When it was objected, "that a tyrannical governor "might refuse obedience to the wisest councillor," he replied: "How can he refuse, exposed as he would be to the penalty of "his disobedience! For when a man in any case rejects wise "counsel, he errs, and will be punished for his error." When it was further objected, that a tyrant had often the will as well as the power, even to kill an honest adviser, the rejoinder is: "And do "you suppose that a man who destroys his best friend can escape "punishment? Would not the very act of which you suppose "him guilty involve his own destruction?" The absurdity of this mode of conducting an argument is too obvious to require com-

¹ III. v. 21. sqq.

² III. ix. 10.

mentary. The reasoner begins by staking his credit on the fact that a thing is so. When the statement is impugned as false or paradoxical, he does not attempt to reply, but merely shifts his ground, and asserts that the thing ought to be so, and that those who prevent its being so deserve to be punished. And this Xenophon calls on us to admire as the quintessence of Socratic wisdom and logic.

No. 3.

The dialogue ¹ with Aristippus, an idle man of the world, is said at the commencement to have been held for the purpose of converting him to a more discreet course of life. The philosopher begins by demonstrating, that a man educated in habits of useful study and self-denial, is more likely to make a good political leader than one whose education has been neglected. Aristippus admits the truth of this self-evident proposition ; upon which Socrates asks, why he does not himself adopt those habits, the efficacy of which, for the object stated, he so freely admits. In answer Aristippus remarks : that, as he has no such object in view, he does not see how the argument bears on his case ; that not being desirous of political power, he prefers leading an independent life as a private citizen ; and he urges some very natural, and in his own view of the case conclusive reasons for his preference. Socrates, without attempting to grapple with these reasons, enters on another equally subtle course of demonstration : that it is a more agreeable thing for a man, himself to exercise power, than to live in subjection to others. Of this general proposition, Aristippus also does not dispute the general truth ; he demurs however to certain of the lecturer's inferences ; and with good reason, as they are not only far-fetched and sophistical, but all rest more or less on the one paradoxical basis, that the state of society in Greece admitted of no medium between the two extremes of social existence : political power and slavery. As regards his own interest in the matter, Aristippus contents himself with renewing his previous declaration, that he is not ambitious of acting the part of a ruler, and adding, that he is equally little apprehensive of becoming a slave.

Here again it is difficult to believe, that the genuine Socrates, with so many effective forms of argument at his disposal, could

¹ II. i. 1.

have selected one so singularly ill adapted to the particular case and person with whom he had to deal. Had Aristippus been a youth who, like Alcibiades, combined ardent political ambition with profligate habits, there would have been no more likely mode of reclaiming him from those habits, than convincing him of the obstacles which they interposed to the attainment of nobler objects. But the same argument addressed to a man who was devoid of ambition or taste for political distinction, was, by its very abor-tiveness, an effectual mode of confirming the errors it was intended to correct.

APPENDIX R. (Page 550.)

ON THE WRITERS OF ATTHIDES.¹

C. MÜLLER ¹, adopting and exaggerating this distinction, assumes the Atthides of Pherecydes, Hellanicus, and other earlier writers, not to have been integral compositions, but portions of more voluminous works by those authors; that they were chiefly occupied with mythical legends borrowed from the old poets; and dwelt but slightly on the events of authentic history. The later Atthidists on the other hand, are supposed by him to have treated their subject in a more critical manner, investigating historical events and chronological epochs with greater diligence, and suggesting philosophical explanations of the popular fables. Every one of these positions may be shown, the greater part of them on data supplied by Müller himself, to be baseless. In the first place, Pherecydes is nowhere mentioned as author of an Atthis. That the Atthis or "Attic history," as it is called by Thucydides, of Hellanicus, was but a section of a more voluminous work, is a hypothesis unsupported by any evidence external or internal. The other alleged points of distinction between his Atthis and that of Clidemus, are disproved by a comparison of the remains of each author in Müller's own collection. In the investigation of authentic history Hellanicus, if not a profoundly critical master, was, judging from existing data, quite on a par with Clidemus. Of the passages cited from the Atthis of the former, seven refer to real events. Only four such passages can be identified in the extant citations from

¹ Ap. Didot, *op. cit.* vol. I. p. LXXXI. LXXXVI.

the Atthis of Clidemus; and in several of these, historical fact is largely seasoned with mythological trifling. Of chronological investigation there is no trace in the collection of Clidemus. Hel-
lanicus on the other hand was, in that department of research, confessedly in advance of his contemporaries, or even of his immediate successors. Of philosophical explanations of the popular fables, the mythological fragments of Clidemus are barren. He everywhere manifests a most orthodox spirit of acquiescence in the letter, even of the most trivial legends which he retails.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

Page

166. There are but two passages which appear to form gentle exceptions, both in the case of the Erotema, to this habitual austerity of the Historian's figurative style. The first is in the speech of the Thebans against the Plateans (III. 64): *τίνες ἂν ὑμῶν δικαιότερον πᾶσι τοῖς Ἕλλησι μισοῖντο*, κ. τ. λ.; the second in the reply of Athenagoras to Hermocrates (VI. 38.): *τί καὶ βούλεσθε, ὦ νεώτεροι*, κ. τ. λ. The other examples of interrogatory eloquence, while not frequent, being but modes of shaping an argument, must rank as figures of the intellectual order.
167. note 2. It seems more natural that the citation by Aristotle, of "the Epitaphian speech" of Pericles, should refer to this address, which, having inaugurated, as it were, the commencement of the Peloponnesian war, was both the last and the most remarkable of its kind delivered by the orator, than, as some commentators suppose, to the one mentioned by Plutarch as having been delivered after the Samian war. The figurative allusion in the passage cited, to the slain warriors, as "the spring," or first fruits, of Athenian chivalry, is far more applicable to the first battle of a great general war, after a prolonged state of peace, than to the casualties of a comparatively inglorious campaign of the imperial republic, against a single greatly inferior adversary.
168. The words, *τὸν προσθέντα τῷ νόμῳ τὸν λόγον τόνδε*, here rendered, "the framer of the law prescribing this oration," mean, or may at least be held to mean, literally: "the man "who added this oration to the law," or custom on such occasions. It has hence been inferred by Dionysius Hal. (Ant. Rom. v. 17), and others after him, that the delivery of the speech was a later addition to the original rite. This however can hardly have been the meaning of Thucydides. It is difficult to believe that in Athens, where, from time

Page

immemorial, public oratory, in some shape or other, was an essential element of all state ceremonial, it could ever have been customary to confer the honour of public burial on citizens, without the solemnity being accompanied by some kind of equally public explanation, by a competent person, why the honour was conferred. The commendation therefore to which Pericles refers, may safely be considered as bestowed not on the author of some recent improvement on the original practice, but rather on the first framer of the written law on the subject; as having combined with (or added to) its other enactments, a formal provision that the oration should be delivered, with regulations probably as to the mode of its delivery, and the appointment of the orator. Herodotus uses the term *προστίθημι* in the very same sense, in a closely similar passage (II. 136.). We have however shaped our aversion in such terms as, without subtilising on the orator's words, should convey the full spirit of his remark; leaving it open whether the speech was, or was not, an original part of the ceremony.

To the ensuing phase: *τοῖς ἐκ τῶν πολέμων θαπτομένοις*, as quite untranslatable into literal English, we have also given a turn, more in harmony with our own idiom, while equally expressive of the orator's meaning.

This commentary might be extended to other passages of these versions; which are indeed but so many illustrations of the difficulty of translating the rhetorical text of Thucydides, in such a manner as to preserve the spirit without any serious breach of the letter.

169. Indirect evidence, that this antithesis between Words and Deeds was a favourite Periclean image, and was employed by Pericles in this oration, much in the mode represented by Thucydides, seems to be contained in the Epitaphian address which Plato, in his *Menexenus* (p. 236.), makes Socrates describe and repeat, as having been composed by Aspasia from materials supplied by Pericles. Of that composition, as of the Thucydidean speech, the antithesis in question forms the exordium and the key-note, and is reiterated and illustrated in the sequel, in the same subtle style with which we are familiar in Thucydides. The two orations also present other points of correspondence, tending to prove,

Page

that Thucydides, however differently he may have worked up the details, had retained much of the substance of the Periclean address. Such are, for example, the connexion into which, in each, the valour of the warriors eulogised has been brought, with the excellence of the institutions under which they were reared; and the contrast between those institutions and others existing in less favoured states.

Whether Plato himself had in view the original of Pericles, or the Thucydidean version, or, possibly both, may be a question.

191. The number ninety, being the distance in miles by the course of the river as estimated by later geographers, between Cunaxa and Babylon, has here been inadvertently noted, instead of the direct distance by land; which is rated by Xenophon (ii. ii. 6.) at about forty-five miles (360 stadia); by other authorities at a third or a fourth more.

- 215, 216. Xenophon's accounts of the strength of the Greek army at the several stages of its route, are singularly vague and contradictory. His expression in the passage here referred to, is (v. iii. 3.), that the numbers were reduced "from about 10,000" to 8,600; "the other 1,400 having been destroyed "by the enemy, the snow, or disease." The original estimate (p. 190.), previous to the battle of Cunaxa, was 12,800. The 10,000 therefore here in question are, it may be presumed, the number at the outset of the Retreat in the familiar sense; when they commenced fighting their way home after the massacre of the Zabatus. Of the mode in which they had been reduced from 12,800 to 10,000 between Cunaxa and the Zabatus, we are left in the dark. Xenophon mentions but a single man killed or wounded in the battle, and that on doubtful report (i. viii. 20.). During the subsequent march to the Zabatus, the only defalcation noticed (ii. ii. 7.) was the desertion of about 350 Thracian light troops. Add to these about 220 victims of Persian treachery at the Zabatus, including officers; and the army, on leaving that station, ought still to have numbered above 12,000 men. Assuming however that by this, and other disasters not specified, it had really been reduced by 1,800 men between Cunaxa and the Zabatus, how are we to reconcile that loss with

the subsequent statements: first, that on its week's route through the Carduchian mountains, it suffered more than all it had previously suffered from Artaxerxes or Tissaphernes (iv. iii. 2.); and secondly, that, as we are here told, the whole diminution of force between the Zabatus and Cerasus was only 1,400 men? In the sequel, after being thus described as reduced to 8,600 at Cerasus, and after experiencing some other losses in the interval, we again find it, at Cotyora, a few weeks later (v. vii. 9.), in the same vague manner, rated at "nearly ten thousand men."

INDEX

TO

VOLUMES FOURTH AND FIFTH.

. *The Numbers refer to Volumes and Pages.*

A.

ABRADATAS and Panthea, romance of, v. 402.
 Acusilaus, iv. 56. 133.; his genealogical work, 134.
 Admirals, the Six, at Arginusæ, their death, v. 279. 610.
 Æolic dialect, iv. 111.
 Æsop, iv. 106.
 Agriculture, Athenian system of, v. 464.
 Agesilaus, v. 284. 288. 307. 310. Xenophon's biographical memoir of, 434.
 Agesilaism of Xenophon, v. 284. 307. 310.
 Alcibiades, his character, v. 144. 257.
 Alcidas, his work on music, iv. 108.
 Alexander the Great, his patronage of literature, iv. 47., v. 531. His treatment of Callisthenes, v. 554—560.
 Amelagoras, or Melesagoras, his Atthis, iv. 180., v. 549.
 Amyrtæus, king of Egypt, age of, iv. 536.
 Anabasis of Xenophon, v. 324. An autobiographical work, 331. How far an impartial one, 332. Its speeches, how far genuine, 338.; inconsistencies of the narrative, 342. 632. Transactions on the Retreat; at Cotyora, 342.; at Cerasus, 343.; at Heraclea, 349.; at Byzantium, 350.; at Parium and Perinthus, 352.; in Western Armenia, 360.; with the Tibarenes, 363.; delineation of character, 353. The Anabasis, when composed, 370.; its division into Books, 371.
 Anabasis of "Themistogenes," v. 276. 364.
 ——— of Sophænetus, v. 542.
 Anaxagoras, his persecution by the Athenians, iv. 27. 520.
 Anaxibius, Spartan navarch on the Bosphorus, v. 214. 226. 269. 350.
 Anaximander of Miletus, his geographical work, iv. 69.

Anaxis, his historical work, v. 545.
 Andocides, iv. 104.
 Antiochus of Syracuse, iv. 192.; his notice of Rome, 194.
 Antiphon, his school of Attic oratory, iv. 102.; his relation to Thucydides, v. 8. 74. 162. 596.
 Apology of Socrates, Xenophon's, v. 452.
 Arginusæ. See Admirals.
 Aræus, his treachery at Cunaxa, v. 607.
 Aristæus of Proconnesus, his accredited prose works, iv. 59. 68. 132.
 Aristotle, his Olympic chronology, iv. 84.
 Artaxerxes Mnemon, v. 185. 357.
 Asidatis of Mysia, plundered by Xenophon, v. 233.
 Aspasia, her connexion with Pericles, iv. 43.; her Epitaphian speech, v. 631.
 Athanas of Syracuse, his historical work, v. 545.
 Athenian agriculture, v. 464.
 ——— domestic life, v. 463.
 ——— landed gentleman, v. 466.
 ——— revenues, Xenophon's treatise on, v. 431.
 Athenians, characteristics of their literary genius, iv. 6. 9. 11. 20.; their persecution of men of science, 27. 519.
 Atthides, writers of, v. 549. 628.
 Attic period, general view of, iv. 1—13.; from 560 to 510 B.C., iv. 16.; from 510 to 404 B.C., iv. 23.; from 404 to 323, iv. 29., v. 1. 481.
 ——— style, iv. 116. 125.
 Autolyceus, son of Lycon, v. 182. 454. 598.

B.

Berosus, his oriental history, v. 487.
 Bion of Proconnesus, iv. 180.
 Books, division into, of Greek historical

works, *iv.* 469., *v.* 53. 322. 371, 272. 620. 623.

Booktrade, *iv.* 39.

Brasidas, his character, *v.* 145.

Byzantium, *v.* 227. 350. See *Anabasis*.

C.

Cadmus of Miletus, *iv.* 56. 132.

Callias, his banquet, *v.* 182. 454. 598.

Callisthenes, his life, character, and death, *v.* 553.; works, 560.; style, 567.

Calpe, *v.* 225.

Cambyse, the elder, *v.* 386. 413.

——— the younger, *iv.* 370. 474.

Carduchians, *v.* 209.

Centrites river, *v.* 210.

Cephisodorus, his historical work, *v.* 546.

Cerasus, *v.* 215. 343.

Charon of Lampsacus, *iv.* 72. 76. 164.

Chirisophus, colleague of Xenophon in command, *v.* 203. 214. 222. 224.

Chronology of Greek historical literature, *iv.* 74.

Cleander, harmost of Byzantium, *v.* 226. 230. 350.

Clearchus, commander of the Cyreian Greeks, *v.* 188. 190.; his military skill, 191. 605.; his murder, 198.; his character, 353.

Cleon his character, *v.* 43—45. 146.

Clidemus, or Clitodemus, his *Atthis*, *v.* 549.

Clitodemus. See *Clidemus*.

Cœratadas, *v.* 229.

Colchians, treatment of, by the Cyreians, *v.* 343.

Comedy, progress of, *iv.* 23. 30.

Conon, *v.* 315. 484.

Corax of Syracuse, his school of rhetoric, *iv.* 28. 95.

Corœbus, his Olympiad, *iv.* 85.

Cotyora, *v.* 216. 342. See *Anabasis*.

Ctesias, *v.* 482.; his system of Oriental history, 485.; compared with Herodotus and Berossus, *iv.* 333., *v.* 487—489.; his Persian history, 493.; compared with Herodotus, 494., *iv.* 401.; his *Indica*, and other works, *v.* 497. 499.; his style, 499.

Cunaxa, battle of, *v.* 191. 605.; site of, *v.* 191. 632.

Cyaxares, *v.* 383. 412.

Cyreian Greeks, their numbers at different stages of their route, *v.* 632.

Cyropædia of Xenophon, epitome of its contents, *v.* 374.; a historical romance,

378.; its historical element, 380.; picture of Persian manners, 386.; its geographical element, 384.; romantic element, 401.; characters, 379. 407.; style, 392. Epilogue, 413.

Cyrus the elder, his character in Herodotus, *iv.* 474.; in Xenophon, *v.* 379. 407.

——— younger, *v.* 185.; Xenophon's character of, 354. 188.; his death, 194.

D.

Damastes of Sigeum, *iv.* 239.

Damon, persecuted by the Athenians, *iv.* 520.

Darius, his character in Herodotus, *iv.* 476.

Deiochus of Proconnesus, *iv.* 179.

Democles of Phygela, *iv.* 181.

Democritus of Abdera, *iv.* 27. 106. 109.

Demophilus, son of Ephorus, *v.* 531. 547.

Diagoras, persecuted by the Athenians, *iv.* 27. 520.

Dialect, Attic, its formation, *iv.* 111. 116.

Ionic, *iv.* 112. 126. Æolic and Doric, *iv.* 111.

Dinon, his *Persica*, *v.* 500.

Dionysii of Syracuse, *iv.* 45., *v.* 503.

Dionysiodorus, his historical work, *v.* 545.

Dionysius of Miletus, *iv.* 162.

Dithyramb, *iv.* 26. 30.

Draco, his laws, *iv.* 53.

Drama, progress of *iv.* 21—24. 30.

E.

Education in Greece during the Attic period, *iv.* 32.

Epaminondas, *v.* 289. 312.; his invasions of Laconia, 313. 618.

Ephorus, *v.* 529.; his *Histories*, 531.; other works, 539.; style, 540.

Epic poetry during the Attic period, *iv.* 3. 23. 25. 31.

Epicharmus, *iv.* 24.

Epilogue of the *Cyropædia*, *v.* 413.

Epimenides, his accredited prose works, *iv.* 59. 132.

Equestrian art, Xenophon's treatise on, *v.* 467.

Euclid of Megara, persecuted by the Athenians, *iv.* 521.

Eudemus of Paros, *iv.* 181.

Eugeon of Samos, *iv.* 181.

Eumelus of Corinth, his accredited prose works, *iv.* 59. 132.

F.

Fable, or Apologue, *iv.* 106.

G.

Geography, the mother of authentic history, *iv.* 68.

Glaucus of Rhegium, his work on musicians and poets, *iv.* 109.

Gorgias, *iv.* 96. 100. 106. 109. 125.; price of his lectures, 36.; his relation to Thucydides, *v.* 162. 598.

Grammatical literature, progress of, *iv.* 105.

H.

Harmene, port of Sinope, *v.* 221.

Harmodius and Aristogiton, *v.* 129.

Hecataeus of Miletus, *iv.* 69.; his life and works, 140. 530.; his geographical research, 144. 529. 530.

Hecatonymus, the Sinopian orator, *v.* 217.

Hellanicus, *iv.* 217.; his works, 219.; his notice of Rome, 234.; his knowledge of the Latin tongue, 237.; his chronological research, 76. 234.

Hellenica of Xenophon, epitome of the contents, *v.* 265.; composition and materials, 273.; Xenophon's Spartan partialities, 283., and Theban antipathies, 284.; state of Greece, 286.; Lysander and Agesilaus, 288.; Pelopidas and Epaminondas, 289.; Xenophon's suppressions and misrepresentations, 292—304.; battle of Corinth, 296.; of Coronea, 299.; of Leuctra, 301.; Messenian independence, 303.; Thessalian affairs, 304.; destruction of Mantinea, 306.; Agesilaism of Xenophon, 307. 310.; Agesilaus and Epaminondas, 312.; Athenian interests and characters, 314.; style, 316.; speeches, 317.; descriptions, 318.; chronology, 320.; time and mode of composition, 322. 620.

Heraclitus of Ephesus, *iv.* 521.

Hermias of Methymna, *v.* 543.

Herodorus of Heraclea, *iv.* 210.

Herodotus, his life and times, *iv.* 241.; the Homer of prose literature, 242. 272. 512.; epochs of his birth and death, 253. 534.; his supposed Olympian recital, 254.; other public recitals, 268. his relation

to Thucydides, 256. 267., *v.* 14. 57. 569.; his death and character, *iv.* 271., *v.* 57.; his work, epitome of its contents, *iv.* 276.; character of his research, 294.; his historical sources, 301—315.; Lydian history, 324.; Assyrian history, 332.; Medo-Persian history, 335.; Egyptian history, 340.; his geographical research, 348.; his credulity, 352.; his religion and superstition, 356.; his theory of the marvellous, 377.; his love of anecdote, 389.; his spirit of hyperbole, 398.; his self-contradictions, 403. 418. 540.; how far a critical historian, 409.; the Scythian expedition of Darius, 411.; estimate of distance by day's journeys, 412.; estimate of time by generations, 416.; battle of Thermopylae, 418. 542.; walls of Babylon, 421. 546.; his chronology, 76.; his geographical criticism, 424.; his philological criticism, 427.; his mythological criticism, 319. 429.; his impartiality, 430.; his "malignity," 449.; his composition and style, 451.; his epic faculty, 452. 466. 547.; his episodes, 458.; division of his work into books, 469., *v.* 624.; his delineation of character, *iv.* 471., *conf.* 431.; Athens and Sparta, 484.; his dramatic management, 499.; his speeches and dialogues, 501.; his descriptive faculty, 505.; his language, in structure, and dialect, 512. 523.

Hiero of Syracuse, his patronage of literature, *iv.* 45.

Hiero, or The Tyrant, Xenophon's Dialogue of, *v.* 427.

Hipparchus, his patronage of literature, *iv.* 20.; his death, *v.* 129.

Hipparchicus of Xenodotus, *v.* 471.

Hippias of Athens, his patronage of literature, *iv.* 19.

—of Elis, his Olympic chronology, *iv.* 82.

Hippiys of Rhegium, his historical works, *iv.* 177.

Historians, early Greek, their preference of fabulous subjects, *iv.* 66.

—prior to Herodotus, *iv.* 131.

—flourishing during the Peloponnesian war, *iv.* 182.

—flourishing during the fourth century B. C., *v.* 1.

Historical evidence, kinds and degrees of, *iv.* 297.

—research, first application of, to real events, *iv.* 72.

Horsemanship, Xenophon's treatise on, *v.* 467.

Hunting, Xenophon's treatise on, *v.* 473.

I.

- Ion of Chius, his life and works, *rv.* 194.
202. 533.
Ionic dialect and style, *rv.* 112. 126.
Iphitus of Elis, his Olympiad, *rv.* 85.
Isocrates, price of his lectures, *rv.* 37.

L.

- Lacedæmonian kings, their votes in council,
v. 21. 570.
Languages, foreign, their study neglected
by the Greeks, *rv.* 35.
Laurian mines, *v.* 432.
Laws, earliest codes of, *rv.* 51.
Libraries, public and private, *rv.* 16. 20. 38.
Lycurgus, his Rhetræ, or written laws, *rv.*
51.; different accounts of his age, 86.
88.
Lyric poetry, progress of, *rv.* 22. 25.; de-
cline of, 31.
Lysias, *rv.* 125.

M.

- Macedonian kings, their patronage of litera-
ture, *rv.* 46.
Marathon, battle of, *rv.* 509. 549.
Melesagoras (see Amelesagoras), his Atthis,
rv. 180.
Memorabilia of Socrates, Xenophon's, *v.*
440.
Menon, colleague of Xenophon, *v.* 198.;
his character, 354.
Metrodorus of Lampsacus, *rv.* 95. 108.
Miscellaneous literature of Attic period, *rv.*
90. 106.
Mosynœcians, *v.* 216.
Mythical legend, rules for appreciating its
historical value, *rv.* 316.

N.

- Nicias, his character, *v.* 142.
Neon, colleague of Xenophon, *v.* 220. 225.
231.

O.

- Œconomist, the, of Xenophœa, *v.* 462.
Olorus, father of Thucydides, *v.* 6.

- Olympiad of Corœbus, *rv.* 85.
——— of Iphitus and Lycurgus, *rv.* 85.
Olympic era, its adaptation to historical
chronology, *rv.* 77.
Oracles, written in prose, *rv.* 54.

P.

- Pamphila, her dates for the births of Hel-
lanicus, Herodotus, and Thucydides, *rv.*
218. 253. 254. 538.
Panthea and Abradatas, romance of, *v.* 402.
Parmenides, *rv.* 520.
Patrons of literature during the Attic
period, *rv.* 40.
Pelopidas, *v.* 289.
Peloponnesian historical registers, *rv.* 53.
76.
Pericles, his patronage of literature, *rv.* 40.;
his connexion with Aspasia, 43.; his cha-
racter, *v.* 140.; his Epitaphian oration,
analysis of, 166. 631.
Periodic style, *rv.* 125.
Persian constitution and manners, *v.* 386.
Phanias of Eresus, *v.* 547.
Phanodemus, his Atthis, *v.* 552.
Pharnabazus, satrap of Phrygia, *v.* 227.
351.
Pherecydes Syrius, *rv.* 56. 68. 183.
——— Leriis, *rv.* 182.
Phidias, persecuted by the Athenians, *rv.*
520.
Philistus, his life, character, and death, *v.*
503.; his works and style, 506.
Philosophical literature, early cultivation
of, *rv.* 68. 90.
Phrynichus, *rv.* 21. 23.
Pisistratus and Pisistratidæ, their influence
on literature, *rv.* 16. 18. 19. 40.
———, his library, *rv.* 16. 38.
Pitanate cohort, *v.* 21. 569.
Plato, his views on education, *rv.* 34.
Polity of Athens, treatise on, *v.* 417. 422.
——— Lacedæmon, Xenophon's treatise
on, *v.* 417.
Polycrates of Samos, his patronage of lite-
rature, *rv.* 20.
Pratinas, *rv.* 23.
Prodicus, *rv.* 102. 108., *v.* 448.
Prose literature, origin of, *rv.* 48. 55.; first
application to historical composition, 66.
68.; to philosophical composition, 68.
90.; to geographical composition, 68.;
to rhetorical composition, 90. 94.
Protagoras, *rv.* 101. 108.; persecuted by
the Athenians, 520.
Proxenus the Boeotian, friend of Xenophon,
v. 186.; his murder, 198.

R.

- Registers of early Peloponnesian history, iv. 53. 76.
 Rhapsodists, iv. 95.
 Rhetorical composition, early cultivation of, iv. 90. 94.
 Rhetoræ, or written laws of Sparta, iv. 51—54.

S.

- Sicillus, Xenophon's country seat at, description of, v. 216. 235.
 Schools and schoolmasters, iv. 35.
 Scylax of Caryanda, his geographical work, iv. 70. 139.
 Seuthes, chief of the Odrysians, enlists the Cyreians, v. 231.
 Sicilian school of rhetoric, iv. 28. 95.
 Silanus the augur, v. 21.
 Simonides of Ceos, the historian, iv. 182.
 Sinope, v. 217. 221.
 Socrates, iv. 520.; his advice to Xenophon, v. 187.; Xenophon's character of, v. 442. 454. 625.
 Solon, his laws, iv. 53.
 Sophænetus, his *Anabasis*, v. 542.
 Sophists, character of, iv. 97. 122. 522.
 Sparta, decline of literary taste in, iv. 7. 12.
 Spartan kings, their votes in council, v. 21. 570.
 Stesimbrotus of Thasus, iv. 194. 196.
 Style, Greek prose, iv. 110.; as dependent on dialect, 111.; as dependent on composition, 120.; sententious style, 122.; periodic style, 125.; Ionic style, 126.; Attic style, 125. 126.; its rhetorical tendency, 127.
 Susarion, iv. 23.
 Symposium of Xenophon, v. 453.; parallel with that of Plato, 459.

T.

- "Ten thousand." See Cyreians.
 Theagenes of Rhegium, iv. 94.
 Themistocles, episode of, in Thucydides, v. 154.
 Themistogenes of Syracuse, his *Anabasis*, v. 276. 364.
 Theodorus of Byzantium, his style, iv. 105.
 Theopompus, his life and character, v. 506. 509.; his *Hellenica* a continuation of Thu-

- cydides, 515.; his *Philippica*, 516.; his other works, 515. 528.; his style, 525.
 Theramenes, his character, v. 316. 613. 617.
 Thermopylae, battle of, its mythical details, iv. 418. 542.
 Thimbron, engages the Cyreians, v. 232.
 Thrasymachus of Chalcedon, his style, iv. 104.
 Thucydides, his birth and parentage, v. 4.; his age, 8., iv. 254.; his relation to Herodotus, v. 14. 57. 569., conf. iv. 256. 266. 267.; his indirect allusions to Herodotus, v. 20.; and to passages of his works, 25.; parallel passages of the two authors, 30.; his Amphipolitan campaign and exile, 32.; how far merited, 38.; his relation to Cleon, 43.; his life in exile, 46.; remission of his sentence, 48.; his death, 56.; character, 57.; state of society which he describes, 64. 578.; his history unfinished, 13.; when published, 49.; its division into books, 53. 572.; its eighth book, 50. 55. 573.; its continuators, 53. 273. 322. 515.; epitome of its contents, 79.; his historical sources, 96.; his speeches, how far authentic documents, 102.; his treatment of mythical and religious matters, 105. 109., conf. 61.; his chronology, 112.; his work a military history, 113.; its composition; plan and spirit of its narrative, 118. 120.; its defects of epic economy, 121. 579.; other anomalies, 11. 132.; its introduction, or "archæologia," 134.; digressive passages, 133.; delineation of character, Pericles, Nicias, Alcibiades, Brasidas, Cleon, 139—146.; speeches as illustrative of character, 147.; speculative or didactic element, 150.; his narrative style, its merits, 153.; its defects, 157. 174. 176.; rhetorical style, its defects and peculiarities, 157. 581.; its merits, 162. 164. 178.; relation of Thucydides to Antiphon and Gorgias 68. 162. 596. 598.; his dialect, 163.; funeral oration of Pericles, analysis of, 166. 630. 631.; other speeches, 173.; description of battles, 176.; of the plague at Athens, 177.; critical summary, 178.
 Thurium, settlement of Herodotus at, iv. 251.
 Tibarenes, their treatment by the Cyreians, v. 363.
 Timæus, his Olympic chronology, iv. 84.
 Timasion, colleague of Xenophon, v. 218. 340.
 Timonides of Loucadia, his epistolary history, v. 544.
 Tiribazus, satrap of Western Armenia, his treatment by the Cyreians, v. 211. 360.

Timas of Syracuse, his school of rhetoric, *rv.* 28. 96.

Tragedy, progress of, *rv.* 23.

Trapezus, *v.* 218.

W.

Women, their social position in Athens, *rv.* 43., *v.* 463.

X.

Xanthus, his *Lydiaca*, *rv.* 170. 531.

Xenomedes of Chios, *rv.* 182.

Xenophanes of Colophon, *rv.* 520.

Xenophon, his birth and parentage, *v.* 181.;

age 181. 598.; early life, 183. 185. 189.;

takes service under Cyrus, 185. 188.

203.; march on Babylonia, in spring

401 *b.c.*, 190.; battle of Cunaxa, in

Sept. 401 *b.c.*, 191.; appointed to com-

mand a division of Cyreian Greeks, 200.

203.; takes the lead in conducting the

retreat, 206.; march up the Tigris, 208.;

Carduchians, 209.; Western Armenia,

army overtaken by winter, 211.; its suf-

ferings, 212.; view of the sea; arrival at

Trapezus in spring, 400 *b.c.*, 213.; attack

on the Drilæ, 215.; transactions at Cera-

sus, 215. 343.; at Cotyora, 216. 342.;

Xenophon's scheme of colonisation, 217.;

dissonsons in the army, 218.; mutiny at

Heraclea, 222. 349.; transactions at

Calpe, 224.; at *Byzantium*, 227. 350.;

at *Parium* and *Perinthus*, 230. 352.;

service under *Seuthes* in Thrace, 231.;

under *Thimbron* in Asia, 233.; attack on

Asidatis, 233.; *Xenophon's* sentence of

exile, its date, and cause, 234. 238. 609.;

bearing of this question on his moral cha-

acter, 243.; his return to Greece with

Agésilas, and settlement at *Scillus*, 234.;

restoration to his civic rights, 236.; his

domestic relations, 236.; close of his life,

237.; his Spartan connexions, 245.;

fought under *Agésilas* at *Coronea*, 246.;

his *Agésilasism*, 284. 307. 310.;

harsh-

ness of his treatment by Athens, 247.;

his character, 250. 349—352.;

his un-

truthfulness, 254. 342—348. 368. *alibi*; his

partiality as a historian, 254. 283. 332.;

his defective patriotism, 256.;

his pagan

piety, 258., *conf.* 201. 210. 225. 233.;

alibi; his philosophy, 260.;

his literary

style, 260.;

his facetious humour, 262.

426. 457—460.;

his works; see *Hellenica*,

Anabasis, *Cyropædia*; the *Polity* of

Lacedæmon, 417.;

the *Polity* of Athens,

417. 422.;

not by *Xenophon*, 425.;

Hiero, or the *Tyrant*, 427.;

on the *Re-*

venues of Athens, 431.;

the *Agésilas*,

434.;

parallel of the *Hellenica*, 435.;

Memorabilia of *Socrates*, 440.;

Apology

of *Socrates*, 452.;

Symposium, 453.;

the *Economist*, 462.;

on the *Equestrian* art,

467.;

the *Hipparchicus*, 471.;

on *Hunt-*

ing, 473.

Xerxes, his expedition, mythical details of, *rv.* 309.

Z.

Zabatus river, massacre of, *v.* 198.

Zeno, *rv.* 27. 520.;

price of his lectures,

36.

Zoilus of *Amphipolis*, his historical work,

v. 547.

END OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

LONDON

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.

NEW-STREET SQUARE





